

3248. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of T. A. Rawlings, Gardner Chacksfield, Riner G. Saeger, C. J. Doll, Clyde W. Risch, John Asher, John C. Akin, Harry Overberg, Raymond J. Kern, Thomas Parker, Elmer C. Luchtendahl, Henry G. Stumpe, Carey A. Fleming, Robert Oaks, Charles Merk, George Flesch, Harry Manz, Joseph L. Kempf, Herman Fox, H. L. Gustin, H. J. Determan, George J. Kopp, Frank Haunsz, Robert W. Stone, W. C. Apfel, Harvey Tibbatts, Earl E. Baker, Albert J. Zeiser, Robert J. Fries, Frank Sholler, Edmund A. Moorman, Joseph Weber, Robert H. Kennedy, John J. Beckstedt, Peter N. Driscoll, Herbert W. Schwartz, and 641 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3249. By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of Kenneth Harris, of New Dorp, Staten Island, N. Y., and 87 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3250. By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, Springfield, Ill., and signed by Robert B. Irwin, secretary-manager, by order of the board of directors, with reference to bills and resolutions pending before the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States pertaining to the subject of freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3251. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of the Clay County Medical Association, Clay City, Ill., opposing Senate bill 1161 and House bill 2861; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3252. By Mr. RAMSPECK: Petitions sent by Mary Scott Russell, president of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Georgia, and signed by numerous other citizens of Georgia, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3253. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Mrs. Gwilym Davis and 79 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3254. Also, petition of Sarah E. Ellsworth and 53 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3255. Also, petition of Rev. Samuel McDowell and 59 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3256. Also, petition of Mrs. S. H. Lewis and 44 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou mighty Sovereign of the sea, with each thought a prayer we come this day glimpsing seas wider and vaster than ever the Psalmist knew, as we take upon our lips his words of old: "There go the ships." There go the ships of our Nation's righteous cause; there go the ships whose thunder makes tyranny tremble, whose wealthy cargo is humanity's fears and its hopes of future years. Today we think of that expanding armada with pride and gratitude for the sweat and toil of the workmen who launched them, for the valiant crusaders who tread their decks, for the trained and tried officers who command them, and for the chaplains who minister in the things that matter most. Upon them all may there rest the benediction of Thy mercy which is like the wideness of the sea.

As on all the seas of the globe, in perils from above and beneath, far-called, our navies sail away, God of our fathers, Thou knowest that every ship carries our faith, our hopes, our prayers, our pledge to be worthy of them until the peace is won for which they must suffer and for which we toil and pray. May our soldiers of the sea incline their hearts to keep Thy law and to be true to the sacred worship hour which hallows each ship when the pennant of our holy faith flies majestically above the Nation's flag yet so close that they merge into one banner of victory, dedicated to the service of God and the brotherhood of man. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 26, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 26, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; and

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. LUCAS]. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scruggs
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on public matters.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

POST-WAR EDUCATION FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES (H. DOC. NO. 344)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 13, 1942, on signing the bill calling for the induction by selective service of young men 18 and 19 years old, I appointed a committee of educators, under the auspices of the War and Navy Departments, to study the problem of education of our service men and women after the war. The objective was to enable those young people whose education had been interrupted to resume their schooling and to provide an oppor-

tunity for the education and technical training of other young men and women of ability after their discharge from the armed services.

This committee has sent me a preliminary report which I am herewith transmitting to the Congress for its consideration, and I hope for its early action.

We at home owe a special and continuing obligation to these men and women in the armed services.

During the war we have seen to it that they have received the best training and equipment, the best food, shelter, and medical attention, the best protection and care which planning, ingenuity, physical resources, and money could furnish in time of war. But after the war shall have been won the best way that we can repay a portion of that debt is to see to it, by planning and by action now, that those men and women are demobilized into an economy which is sound and prosperous, with a minimum of unemployment and dislocation; and that, with the assistance of government, they are given the opportunity to find a job for which they are fitted and trained in a field which offers some reasonable assurance of well-being and continuous employment.

For many what they desire most in the way of employment will require special training and further education. As a part of a general program for the benefit of the members of our armed services I believe that the Nation is morally obligated to provide this training and education and the necessary financial assistance by which they can be secured. It is an obligation which should be recognized now, and legislation to that end should be enacted as soon as possible.

This is a good time not merely to be thinking about the subject, but actually to do something about it. Nothing will be more conducive to the maintenance of high morale in our troops than the knowledge that steps are being taken now to give them education and technical training when the fighting is over.

Every day that the war continues interrupts the schooling and training of more men and women, and deprives them of the education and skills which they would otherwise acquire for use in later life. Not only the individual welfare of our troops, but the welfare of the Nation itself, requires that we reverse this trend just as quickly as possible after the war.

Vocational and educational opportunities for veterans should be of the widest range. There will be those of limited education who now appreciate, perhaps for the first time, the importance of general education, and who would welcome a year in school or college. There will be those who desire to learn a remunerative trade or to fit themselves more adequately for specialized work in agriculture or commerce. There will be others who want professional courses to prepare them for their life's work.

Lack of money should not prevent any veteran of this war from equipping himself for the most useful employment for

which his aptitudes and willingness qualify him. The money invested in this training and schooling program will reap rich dividends in higher productivity, more intelligent leadership, and greater human happiness.

We must replenish our supply of persons qualified to discharge the heavy responsibilities of the post-war world. We have taught our youth how to wage war; we must also teach them how to live useful and happy lives in freedom, justice, and decency.

Specifically, I agree with the recommendations made by the committee in this regard as follows:

1. The Federal Government should make it financially feasible for every man and woman who has served honorably for a minimum period in the armed forces since September 16, 1940, to spend a period up to 1 calendar year in a school, a college, a technical institution, or in actual training in industry, so that he can further his education, learn a trade, or acquire the necessary knowledge and skill for farming, commerce, manufacturing, or other pursuits.

2. In addition, the Federal Government should make it financially possible for a limited number of ex-service men and women selected for their special aptitudes, to carry on their general, technical, or professional education for a further period of 1, 2, or 3 years.

This assistance from Government should include not only cost of instruction but a certain amount of money for maintenance.

One incidental benefit of permitting discharged veterans to put in a year or more of schooling or training would be to simplify and cushion the return to civilian employment of service personnel. And I might call to your attention the fact that it costs less per year to keep a man at school or college or training on the job, than to maintain him on active military duty for a year.

While the Federal Government should provide the necessary funds and should have the responsibility of seeing that they are spent providently and under generally accepted standards, the control of the educational processes and the certification of trainees and students should reside in the States and localities.

I am sure that the Congress will agree with me that the report of this committee constitutes a helpful and constructive point of departure in the working out of a practical program for the meeting of this situation. Various recommendations are contained in the report concerning the administration of the plan. While there may be differences as to some of the details, I am confident that the Congress will find merit in the general objectives.

So far as disabled soldiers are concerned, the Congress is aware that, pursuant to existing statutes, the Veterans' Administration is prepared to conduct a program of rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disability. The program is designed to provide for the special needs of war-disabled veterans, and to furnish educational and training opportunities to help them take their places in civilian life. The program has

already been initiated, and will be expanded as the war proceeds.

The new program of the Federal Security Agency will make provisions for veterans whose disabilities are not service connected.

The Army and the Navy require a large number of workers skilled and experienced in various occupations and professions. Men who are filling these posts are acquiring valuable training and experience. A man who has become a mechanical draftsman, a cartographer, a meteorologist, a cook, or a baker may succeed in finding a similar post in civilian life. In a great many other occupations, such as those dealing with tank or tractor maintenance and repair, or with radio operation and maintenance, men are acquiring basic skill and experience which will provide a solid foundation for learning a related civilian occupation.

In addition, the United States Armed Forces Institute, which is a joint operation of the Army and Navy, offers men and women in the armed services a chance to enroll in courses usually offered by colleges, high schools, technical and occupational schools, in which they can study in their off-duty time. The Institute prepares self-teaching textbooks which enable them to learn a subject entirely on their own initiative; or, if they prefer, they may join any one of hundreds of classes which have or are being established in Army camps and posts and in Navy installations, and in Army and Navy hospitals, here in the United States and in places all over the world. Or if they wish, they can study by the correspondence method with the Institute or with one of its overseas branches the same as any student in a correspondence school.

Opportunities for vocational training and for systematic schooling within the armed services will be expanded and re-oriented during periods of demobilization and up to the moment of discharge.

Therefore, if the Congress adopts the general objective outlined herein, our men and women in the armed forces will be afforded opportunities for continuance of their education and vocational training—first, during the war; second, during the demobilization period; and, third, for a year or more after their separation from the service.

While the successful conclusion of this great war is by no means within our sight, yet it may well be said that the time to prepare for peace is at the height of war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 27, 1943.

BUTTER RATION-POINT VALUE—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, MILWAUKEE COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., relating to the ration-point value per pound on butter.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present point value of butter as fixed by the Office of Price Administration is excessive, and by reason thereof is depriving many families of fats vitally needed in order for workers in such families to do efficient work; and

Whereas it is authoritatively reported that there is plenty of butter in Government storage, so that there is no valid excuse for the existing high ration-point value: Therefore be it

Resolved by the county Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, in regular meeting assembled this 13th day of October 1943, That the Office of Price Administration be, and it is hereby, petitioned to immediately lower the ration-point value per pound of butter to a reasonable point value; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forthwith sent by the county clerk to the two Senators from Wisconsin and the Representatives in Congress from the county of Milwaukee; to Prentiss M. Brown, O. P. A. Administrator; and to President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

PROTEST AGAINST IMPOSITION OF SALES TAX—RESOLUTION OF CONSUMERS' LEAGUE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Consumers' League of Rhode Island, protesting against the imposition of a Federal sales tax.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Treasury Department and the Congress of the United States are now concerned with applying new taxes to increase the funds needed by the Government to use in winning the war; and

Whereas in this connection, there is considerable sentiment for a general sales tax on all goods and services bought by the American people; and

Whereas such a sales tax would place the bulk of the burden of taxes on the 20,000,000 families estimated by O. P. A. to be living on less than \$2,500 a year, whose purchases constitute 62 percent of all purchases of goods and services; and

Whereas this type of tax would favor those best able to pay by confining the tax to the relatively small percentage of their income used by this group to buy goods and services, and relieving them of the duty of paying on increased war profits and individual incomes; and

Whereas such a condition would result in hardship being worked on one group in the community while the group best able to bear the tax burden is relieved of its tax responsibility, thus negating the President's plan for equality of sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Consumers' League of Rhode Island unalterably oppose the enactment of a sales-tax law and favor the establishment of a tax program which will make for the sharing of war sacrifices by all the people of the community; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, all Rhode Island Senators and Congressmen, and to the press.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Republican Club in favor of pending legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, establish a quota for the Chinese people, and make persons of the Chinese race eligible for naturalization.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a report, No. 732, of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, in the House of Representatives, and a proposed bill, No. 3070, now pending before the House, to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws, and establish a quota for Chinese people, and make persons of the Chinese race eligible for naturalization; and

Whereas these exclusion laws originated many years ago, primarily for the purpose of stopping the flow of Chinese laborers into the construction camps of the country, and for other economic reasons; and

Whereas much has happened since then to relieve the condition bringing about such legislation; and

Whereas the people of the United States and of China have established such firm bonds of friendship and understanding that the people of the United States are eager to remove any legislation that makes discriminations against the Chinese with regard to entry into this country: Be it

Resolved by the National Republican Club, That we respectfully urge the passage of the proposed bill, No. 3070, repealing the Chinese exclusion laws, fixing an annual quota for China, and permitting the naturalization of Chinese.

POST-WAR DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS ARMY AND NAVY SUPPLIES TO EX-SERVICE-MEN—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas after World War No. 1 the Government of the United States had on hand a large amount of Army and Navy clothing and supplies for which it had no use; and

Whereas these supplies were disposed of by sale to the highest bidders, who in turn disposed of them to the general public through so-called Army and Navy stores, and through other sources; and

Whereas such method of disposal made large fortunes for a comparatively few individuals and resulted in no benefit to ex-servicemen; and

Whereas after the termination of the present war there will be many ex-servicemen, especially disabled ex-servicemen, who will be struggling to establish themselves in business and adjust their lives to civilian activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in regular session assembled, That we memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact such laws or prescribe such regulations as may be necessary so that after the termination of the present world war all surplus Army and Navy supplies will be disposed of by the United States Government only to ex-servicemen, with the first preference in their disposition to be given to disabled ex-servicemen, to the end that these ex-servicemen may establish themselves in business and be better enabled to earn a livelihood and adjust themselves into civilian life and activities after the termination of the war.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. KILGORE introduced a bill (S. 1477) for the relief of Carl M. Frasure, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MISSOURI RIVER AT KANSAS CITIES, MO. AND KANS. (H. DOC. NO. 342)

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, together with a report dated June 9, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, the Missouri River and tributaries at Kansas City, Mo. and Kans., be printed, with illustrations, as a document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE OF THE SENATE AND FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Does the Two-Thirds Rule of the Senate Impede U. S. Foreign Policy?" delivered by Senator O'MAHONEY on the Town Meeting of the Air, Thursday evening, October 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF FREE ENTERPRISE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REVERCOMB

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Preservation of Free Enterprise," delivered by him from New York on October 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFEAT OF FEDERAL-AID-TO-EDUCATION BILL—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. STROUT

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Robbing Children of Their Birthright," written by Richard L. Strout, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL CASIMIR PULASKI DAY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "General Casimir Pulaski Day," published in the Hearst newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION—LETTERS FROM COLORADO

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, during the debate last week on the Federal-aid-to-education bill I was questioned as to the number of letters I had received from those other than school teachers favorable to the bill. I have had a survey made of my correspondence and find that there was one letter from a very fine Colorado lady, who is chairman of the legislative committee of a large or-

ganization of women in Colorado, and there were nine letters from which it could not be told whether the writers were school teachers.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed by me to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, under date of October 4, 1943, and his reply under date of October 5, 1943. The letters relate to a serious defect in the operation of the Social Security Act. I am glad to note that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has taken up the cudgels with respect to this matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1943.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I wish to call your attention to a very serious defect in the operation of the Social Security Act.

It is my understanding that employees who are called into the armed forces are put into the same position as an employee who leaves to go into some occupation not covered by the Social Security Act. In other words, if they have not been in private employment long enough to build up a sufficient number of credits, they will only be entitled to actual cash represented by the deductions paid during the time of their employment, and when they return from military duty, they will have to start all over again.

This certainly works an injustice on our service men. I urge that an amendment to the Social Security Act be passed, waiving the necessary requirements of the present law insofar as men in the armed forces are concerned, and that their benefits accrue on the same basis as they would if they had continued in private industry.

I ask that your committee give this matter your serious consideration. We must not penalize the boys who are fighting our battles for us.

Yours for Victory,
ALEXANDER WILEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 5, 1943.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have your letter of October 4, with reference to an amendment to the Social Security Act.

Your understanding of the Social Security Act as it affects men in the armed service may be correct. However, the whole Social Security question will be under examination after we have finished the Tax Act at which time the Social Security status of the men in the armed forces will be considered.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER F. GEORGE.

NAVY DAY LETTER FROM ADMIRAL KING

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, before beginning my formal Navy Day speech, I desire to read a letter which will be of special interest to all Members of the Senate—a letter which contains sentiments of which all Senators may justly be proud.

LXXXIX—554

The letter is from none other than Admiral King, the commander in chief of the United States Fleet, and Chief of Naval Operations, whose inspiring leadership of the Navy in the present war has commanded the admiration of all Americans. The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., October 24, 1943.
The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington,
D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Navy Day presents an opportunity, of which I am desirous of taking advantage, to send a message to the Members of Congress in appreciation of the hearty cooperation and support which they have given to the Navy since the outset of the war. The fact that the requests of the Navy have been acted upon promptly, unanimously, and without the slightest indication of partisanship, has been not only a source of encouragement to the personnel of the Navy, but has assured us that you have confidence in us and that the legislative branch of the Government is wholeheartedly behind us in our efforts to win the war.

It is a distinct privilege to take this opportunity to express, in the name of my fellow officers and of the enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, our appreciation of your cooperation.

Your unfailing aid and support has been an inspiration, and when the history of this war is written, the record will show that the Navy's achievements have been, in great measure, brought about by the confidence that the Congress has shown toward the Navy.

The Navy salutes the Members of the Congress as we march on together to what will be a complete victory and, we trust, a speedy one.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST J. KING,
Admiral, United States Navy; Commander
in Chief, United States Fleet; and
Chief of Naval Operations.

NAVY DAY, 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, today the people of the United States are observing Navy Day. Navy Day is appropriately fixed on the birthday of a great supporter and friend of the Navy, ex-President Theodore Roosevelt. Indeed, the Roosevelt name has occupied, and will always occupy, a high place in the history of the Navy. Our present Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has been from the very outset of his public service intensely naval-minded and has rendered, since he became President of the United States, among his many other services to the country, an outstanding contribution in the development of our impregnable Navy.

I have said Americans are observing rather than celebrating Navy Day for a special reason. In the midst of war—with the security of the Nation and the very lives of our fellow citizens at stake—it is not seemly to observe this day in a carnival mood. It is much more appropriate that we observe Navy Day this year in solemnity, reviewing what has transpired and recognizing the sacrifices which all, particularly our fighting forces, must endure before certain victory is attained.

It should be said at the very outset of our observance of this day that the Mem-

bers of the Congress and the people of the United States have supreme confidence in the ability of our Navy to triumph over whatever trials and difficulties the future may unfold. This confidence has been strengthened by the way in which our naval forces have already overcome in great measure the handicap resulting from the Pearl Harbor disaster.

Let us look back to Navy Day a year ago.

The United States Navy, operating in conjunction with the fleets of the United Nations, had only then begun to take the offensive against the enemy. Even the victory of the Battle of Midway, during which the Japanese lost over 4,800 killed or drowned, compared to American losses of 307, was not an offensive action. But, by October 27, 1942, we had successfully concluded the Battle of Santa Cruz Island—an offensive action from beginning to end. Since that day we have never lost the initiative.

Less than 2 weeks after Navy Day, 1942, the United States Navy took part in the Allied landing on north Africa. On the success of that action depended the entire north African campaign. Nor did the activities of our Navy become less after the eventful day in November. Great convoys of merchant vessels, escorted by ships of the United States Navy, carried supplies across the South Atlantic. Other convoys, carrying supplies to our comrades-in-arms, swarmed across the North Atlantic to Murmansk and Liverpool under the protecting guns and planes of our Navy.

The immensity of the convoy-protection problem can be better understood when one realizes that, for months after the north African landing, our supply routes were never less than 1,400 miles in length, and often many thousands of miles long. In those days, the enemy had a water route of between 90 and 150 miles to their front, and they could fly their planes directly to bases immediately behind their lines.

After Navy Day, 1942, the United States Navy participated in offensive operations throughout the Mediterranean area. American warships, together with warships of France, Greece, Canada, Poland, Great Britain, and the Netherlands, brought the battle to the enemy from the eastern Mediterranean to Sardinia, and from the islands formerly occupied by the enemy off the Tunisian coast to action along the shores of the Italian mainland.

Units of the United States Navy took part in the landing on Sicily and in the support of ground troops after that landing. Units of the United States Navy took part in the landing at Salerno, and they are even now working in the closest coordination with our advancing land forces.

The offensive action of the United States Navy in the Atlantic and in the Mediterranean has had an equally great counterpart in the offensive action of the United States Navy in the Pacific.

The battle of Santa Cruz Island was followed by the successful battle of Guadalcanal. From that day forward,

the story of the naval operations in that area has been one of unbroken victories.

Not the least of the attainments of the United States Navy during the past year has been the heroic role it played in driving the Japanese from their last foothold in the Western Hemisphere—the Aleutians. Assisted by units of the Canadian Navy, the United States Navy took part in the landing on Attu. Its ships and its planes blasted Kiska until the Japanese were forced to abandon it without a fight.

Everywhere along the outer defense zone of Japan, the United States Navy has attacked. Twice they have struck at Marcus and Wake Islands. Their blows have fallen at Malmahere, Makin Island, and on the Gilbert Islands. Japanese merchant shipping to the extent of over 2,500,000 tons has been sunk—75 percent of this tonnage by submarines of the United States Navy.

In the very midst of this war, our Navy has undergone a phenomenal growth. Three years ago, there were 1,076 vessels; today there are over 14,000. Three years ago, the Navy had 1,744 planes of various types; on July 31, 1943, 18,269 planes. In the month of September alone, 2,000 more planes were added to that number. Today, the Navy has more than 29,000 pilots, more than 24 times its pilot personnel of pre-war days, and more than double this number will be ready for action by next year.

The immense tonnage of the fighting ships of the United States Navy has been augmented during 1942–43 by the acquisition of large portions of the French and Italian Fleets. Thus, on Navy Day, 1943, the United Nations face the enemy with a naval strength many times greater than that of their foes.

In reviewing the activities of the past year, we should extend credit to the co-operation between the United States Navy and the fleets of our allies that has helped on our road to victory. The close coordination of land, sea, and air forces of our own armed services and the spur to action in the Far East which emerged from the Quebec Conference have been of inestimable value.

Officers and men of the United States Navy have always before them the dauntless example of the great naval heroes of the past, and in this very war the example of Admirals Norman R. Scott and Daniel J. Callaghan, who died in action on the bridges of their triumphant cruisers, and of thousands of other noble souls who have gone down to honored graves in submarines, surface craft, and airships.

The future holds much in achievement and, yes, in sacrifice, for the United States Navy. We can expect augmented naval action in the Atlantic. We can expect—with the release of units of our fleet from Mediterranean operations—smashing blows against the enemy in the Pacific. To paraphrase the great American naval hero, John Paul Jones, "We have not yet begun to fight."

The observance of Navy Day should embrace more than an expression of our pride in the size of our Naval Establish-

ment, in the workmanship that has produced such powerful and varied types of fighting craft—on the sea, in the air, and under the sea.

On this Navy Day, more than ever before, our thoughts turn to the personnel of the Navy.

Wars are not won by steel and ammunition alone. In the last analysis, manpower wins battles. As chairman of your Committee on Naval Affairs, I am pleased to bear testimony of the fact that there is no group of naval officers and men superior to ours in courage, in knowledge of naval warfare, in the spirit of self-sacrifice, and in devotion to and pride in the Navy. Man for man, ship for ship, on the sea, under the sea, and in the air, we have the most efficient Navy in the world.

It is, therefore, the officers and enlisted men of the Navy, which of course, includes the marines, the Coast Guard, the devoted women of the WAVES, SPARS, and MARINES, whom we especially felicitate on this occasion.

Those of us who have been privileged to have personal knowledge of the training and the caliber of the personnel of our Navy find it difficult adequately to express our admiration for them. They are representative of the very best type of Americans—in character, in physical and mental alertness, and in patriotism. Our Navy officers fear no danger; their personal comforts are inconsequential; they perform their duties without regard to danger, wholeheartedly and with a grim determination to face death calmly and heroically.

No tribute to the Navy would be adequate without particularly emphasizing the contribution being made by the enlisted men. They are the backbone of the Navy; they are recruited from the fiber of the average American home throughout the length and breadth of our land; they represent every color, class, and creed of our complex population; they know no set hours of work, they work all day and all night cheerfully when there is work to do, and if need be, they will fight all day and all night for their homeland and its ideals.

Today we salute the gallant and brave men of the Navy. Today from this Capitol, the temple of our Government of laws and not of men, the Representatives of the sovereign States of this great Republic extend to each and all of them our profound gratitude. We humbly thank the God of Nations for giving to our country in this great crisis such strong and noble defenders. May their efforts be rewarded with a complete and lasting victory, and may they soon return to us from all the seas of the world to receive publicly our plaudits and to enjoy with their loved ones and their fellow citizens the blessings of peace which through their unfaltering efforts we soon will enjoy.

To the men of the Navy, in every part of this war-stricken world, we cry out, "We shall not forget—we shall not forget."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that no words of mine could add to the

eloquent language of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts; yet, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and a member of the minority party, I desire to express a few ideas on this day of commemoration.

This, the second Navy Day to be observed while the United States has been at war, is a day on which all of us whose very lives have depended upon the steadfast courage of the officers and men of the United States Navy, should solemnly offer up our prayers for the selfless sacrifices of those gallant heroes. In a spirit of reverent pride, we should recall what has happened in the past and look forward with confidence to the increasingly important role which the Navy will play in the events which will eventually lead to certain victory over our enemies.

In the span of a single year the entire world panorama of naval action has changed. Although the battle of Midway takes its place with the great battles of all time, it was still a defensive action. The Japanese were moving in force into the central Pacific. They were stopped. The autumn of 1942 found the United States Navy beginning to take the initiative, not only in the Pacific, but on every ocean.

Since the last Navy Day, the United States Fleet has taken part in the landing of troops in north Africa, in the landing of troops in Sicily, and in the landing of troops in Italy. Since the last Navy Day, American naval units have convoyed more than 4,000 ships of the United Nations, with more than 99½ percent of this number arriving safely at their destination. Since the last Navy Day our naval units have attacked the enemy in Norwegian coastal waters and at Wake Island. Since the last Navy Day, American naval units have helped to rid the Aleutians of their last Japanese invader. Since the last Navy Day, our Navy has supported our land advances in the Solomons and on New Guinea. Since the last Navy Day, our fighting naval forces have swelled to over 2,500,000 tons: the toll of Japanese merchant shipping sent to the bottom of the Pacific. Since the last Navy Day, our naval units have brought the power of American sea might to bear against the outer bastions of Japan on Marcus Island and in the Gilberts.

Throughout the vast Pacific, the initiative—the ability to strike at the most vulnerable spots when and where those blows might do the most damage to the enemy—belongs to the United States Navy.

Admiral William F. Halsey has said:

The Japanese have suffered losses out of all proportion to the efforts they have made to halt our offensive.

Those losses will be made even greater.

I need not tell the Senate what endurance, what sacrifices our certain victory in the future will entail. There will be many homes saddened by the loss of loved ones. But, this anguish will not be in vain. There will be other Navy Days—days on which you and I may again pay tribute to those who deemed no way of pain too hard that we might

live—days on which we may honor the officers and men of the United States Navy under the flag we love, in the security of a victorious peace.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 970) authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] to insert after line 9 a new section.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure that the people of this country and the Members of the Senate will be sympathetic with the view which some of us so seriously entertain, that the adoption of Senate Resolution 192 is to begin the war against World War No. 3 by appeasement. We all know, Mr. President, that the thing that is important is not what the Senate now says, but what the Senate discloses to the world it will do after this war. It is not unnatural that Allied Nations look upon the policy of the United States with doubt and misgiving, for our record leaves a sorry tale of fidelity in peace to those who fought with us for a better world in war.

The Senate cannot escape the obligation of advising the people and the nations of the world that it does not propose again the betrayal of our obligations to our allies and our debt to our dead.

The League to Enforce Peace was led by the most celebrated group of men which probably could have been assembled in the country before the World War. When I look at the platform of the League to Enforce Peace, adopted in 1915, and when I compare that platform with Senate Resolution 192, after World War No. 1 and in the midst of a greater war, World War No. 2, and see the pitiable weakness of the latter, I wonder how far the Senate has retrogressed from the laudable purposes of the group who formulated the League to Enforce Peace in 1915.

Mr. President, let me read that platform of the League to Enforce Peace:

We believe it to be desirable for the United States to join a league of nations binding signatories to the following:

First. All justifiable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.

Second. All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration, and recommendation.

Third. The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.

Fourth. Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal mentioned in article 1.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah? I happen to know that the Senator from Florida is trying his best to conclude his discussion by 1:30 o'clock this afternoon. He is very generous and desires to yield, but I am fearful that if questions are asked him he will not be able to conclude within the time he has set for himself.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I believe that the question I wish to ask, Mr. President, will be helpful to the Senator from Florida in what he is trying to accomplish.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad to yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have no desire to ask a question which will not build up what the Senator from Florida is saying.

Mr. PEPPER. I always welcome inquiry by the able Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there are two matters which I wish to call to the Senator's attention. The way in which the Senator stated his introduction to the quotation from the platform of the League to Enforce Peace implied that the Senate of the United States had adopted that platform. Is that true?

Mr. PEPPER. I did not intend to imply that. I was referring to the group of distinguished persons who adopted that platform in 1915.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Very well. There was one other statement made by the Senator from Florida which was just a slip of the tongue. He meant to say in 1915, before we got into the World War. The World War, which was in progress in 1915, was the stimulant which brought about the organization of the League to Enforce Peace.

Mr. PEPPER. As usual, the able and scholarly Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there is one other point which should be made. It has probably been made in the discussion already had. The League

to Enforce Peace was not reaching out into the clear blue sky to build an organization around something which had not already become a part of the policy of the United States. It is true that the World War was a stimulus, but, as the Senator from Florida knows, there was the famous joint resolution of 1910 which passed both the Senate and the House of Representatives and was signed by the President. That joint resolution provided for the use of our Army and Navy in an international way. The story of the League to Enforce Peace is so important, and it led to so much good in international organization, that I felt that not even the slightest implication ought to go out that the Senate or the Congress sponsored it legally. At the same time, while Congress did not sponsor it legally, Congress had already paved the way for it, not only by the joint resolution of 1910, but also by joining the International Court of Arbitration.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator for his valuable contribution to the subject.

Mr. President, of course I do not intend to imply that the League to Enforce Peace was a congressional organization, or that its platform had congressional authority. What I wanted to emphasize was—and the able Senator from Utah has assisted me, as he usually does, by referring to the joint resolution of 1910 which the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] also mentioned in his address—how much we did or were willing to do in 1910, how much the League to Enforce Peace, which was a great outpouring of civilian sentiment, unofficial in character, but representing a distinguished collection of American mentalities and spirits, was willing to do in 1915, how much the world—except the United States—said in the League of Nations Covenant. Mr. President, how much we have said in the Atlantic Charter, how much we have said in the declaration of the United Nations, and how little we have said in Senate Resolution 192.

Mr. President, today is the heir of all history. Beginning with the prophets in the Old Testament, Isaiah and Micah, who dreamed of a federation of mankind under the fatherhood of God, and coming down through the leagues of the Greek and Roman city states, down through the temporal authority of the church, down through the aspirations and utterances of the Middle Ages, down through the Congress of Vienna and the various European congresses which succeeded it, down through the creation of the Pan American Union, down through the Hague conferences, and then, as I have said, down through the League of Nations Covenant and subsequent documents which I have enumerated, runs the growing stream of demand for an effective international organization which will rid the world of the scourge of war and promote the welfare of the people of the world.

Mr. President, in this good year—I should say, perhaps, due to its tragedy, this bad year of 1943—our Foreign Relations Committee, a committee which

put 50 amendments on the Treaty of Versailles when it reported it to the Senate, proposes to approach the prospect of World War No. 3 with no declaration, no sentiment, no expression, and no assurance stronger than Senate Resolution 192.

Mr. President, I read yesterday the declaration of the three faiths, the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jewish. I shall not read the whole declaration, but I shall read paragraph 5 headed "International institution to maintain peace with justice must be organized":

5. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration, and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

That great religious combination, Mr. President—the first time the representatives of the ministry of these three great faiths have ever come together, and, after long deliberation, produced a single document which expressed their common aspiration and their common prayer for peace for mankind—they, too, have asked the world, have asked the country, have asked the Senate to say something that is meaningful in approaching the dire prospect of World War No. 3.

I read yesterday, Mr. President, from the report of the conference on reconstruction of the great Protestant Episcopal Church which met at Cleveland, Ohio, October 2 to October 11 of this year, calling out for an organization which would deal affirmatively with the challenging economic problems, with the political and social and financial questions which confront us from every corner of the globe, and which will be more acute when the war is over than they are even during the progress of the war, and calling for the establishment of an international authority. Yet, Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is asked to ignore the kind of organization which should be created; it is asked to equivocate and leave purposely obscure the nature of that institution. It is left, Mr. President, with purposeful indefiniteness; I might say it is impregnated with studied ambiguity, in the hope that some passageway through the conflicting opinions of the Senate might easily be found which would deceive nobody save ourselves.

The resolution of the Foreign Relations Committee has not been willing to say more than international authority; so that one may contend, as was said by one Senator, that it includes a league of nations, and another Senator may say it does not; one Senator may say it authorizes a world court and another Senator deny it; one Senator may say that it authorizes, as was said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], an international police force, and another member of the subcommittee may say he is for it because it does not provide for an international police force. One able Sen-

ator, who has been on the side of the isolation in this body since the controversy has raged, has said, if he is properly quoted in the press and I properly remember the quotation, that he is going to support the resolution because it does not mean anything, and another Senator, who has been on the same side, has indicated, I believe, that he is not going to support it, because, while it does not mean anything, he does not want to commit himself to anything that might mean anything.

So we have the spectacle of the able majority leader and the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who have been on the side of collaboration in world affairs, standing side by side with the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye], who has been equally distinguished in his fight for isolation, both, Mr. President, unquestionably supporting with enthusiasm the same resolution. If those Senators have not changed their sentiments, then, we are not giving the Nation a fair assurance of what the sentiment of the Senate is.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the Senate cannot afford to be silent as to whether its purpose is an effective international organization, with affirmative and distinct functions after the war, although I hope it will be organized during the progress of the war. The pending resolution is not willing to say that we shall set up an organization which shall try to reconcile the difficult questions of access to raw materials, of stabilizing world currencies, of providing for the international development of international resources by the capital of all willing men and nations. It is unwilling to try to provide any machinery by which the economic conflict and clash of national interest upon national interest might be peacefully resolved.

But, Mr. President, Senate Resolution 192 contains another strange and significant silence and that is that it fails to provide by even a suggestion or intimation that there should be set up as a part of the international institution which we envisage an ancillary institution the purpose of which would be to settle peacefully the disputes of the nations of the world. Yet the judicial leaders, the jurists of the United States of America, from the days of Elihu Root, and before and since, have been leaders in world opinion, according to their professions at least, in the insistence that there must be a resort to law in the settlement of international conflicts rather than recurrence and retrogression to the rule of the jungle in settling the affairs of nations.

Yet, Mr. President, we see the Foreign Relations Committee seriously and impatiently propose to the Senate that we say not a word about a world court which has been recommended to the Senate of the United States by three Republican and one Democratic President—not a word, Mr. President, to give assurance that we will not do again what we did when those three Republican Presidents and the one Democratic President proposed that the Senate adhere to an international court to promote justice by

peaceful methods among the nations and the peoples of the world. Not a word, Mr. President, do they say in Senate Resolution 192 about the United States of America even advocating the settlement of international disputes by judicial and peaceful means.

We know what the sad history of the World Court in this body is. It came to this body, Mr. President, under the recommendation of President Harding. Shortly after the recommendation for adherence was made by President Harding, it was repeated by President Coolidge; indeed, I believe both recommendations occurred in 1923, one in February and the other later in the year. Yet, Mr. President, because of the Senate technique, which was conceived of by the founding fathers in the Constitution as being properly applicable to bilateral treaties, the kind which they were accustomed to think of in those days, treaties of importance generally only to the two nations parties thereto, and because the founding fathers were afraid that this newly created Government might give certain fishing rights off the coast of New England to some foreign power in adverse effect upon their own interest, they put a provision in the Constitution requiring that no treaty can be made save by the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting upon it. I say, Mr. President, due to that constitutional requirement, which has proved, by what we did to the League of Nations and the World Court, to be not only outmoded and antiquated, but a danger to the security of the Nation and to the world—I say because of that constitutional requirement, put into the Constitution to meet conditions which no longer exist, and because of the Senate technique, the procedure by which, when we deal with treaties, we regard ourselves as dealing with an ordinary piece of legislation, regardless of how many nations waited, regardless of what high hopes were theirs, regardless of the consequences and effect in relation to the security of the world, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate held that recommendation for adherence to a world court month after month and year after year, and the Senate debated it month after month and year after year, so that, although it was proposed in 1923, it finally cleared the hurdle of the Senate in 1926, 3 years later.

That was after we had blighted the hope of mankind by doing a similar thing to the League of Nations.

I believe the Senate attached five reservations to the protocol for a world court, recommended, as I stated, by three Republican Presidents. In a spirit of egotism which sometimes gets hold of us, unbecoming to us, we presumed that surely the signatory powers to the world court would take anything we sent back as a reservation—a bit of vanity. Those signatory powers at least indicated enough integrity and pride that only five of the whole number acceded to the reservations put on by the Senate of the United States, and the document was allowed to die insofar as our adherence

was concerned, and for 2 years no President of the United States dared to make public mention of the matter again.

It came back before the Senate in 1930, I believe, by President Hoover. Later it was recommended by President Roosevelt. Finally, in 1935, although there was a majority vote in the Senate in favor of adherence, because a two-thirds vote was not gained in this body, again the United States Senate failed to take its honorable part in setting up a world institution which might maintain and preserve world peace. Yet, in the face of that history of this body, we are asked to believe that a resolution which says "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," can fairly be said to indicate that we will adhere to a world court. That may have been in the minds of the committee which drafted the language.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. What the Senator is now discussing is of vast importance, and I shall add to my statement of awhile ago by saying that I have on my desk three closely typed pages defining the word "power," and in all those definitions the word "law" and the word "justice" do not appear a single time.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. I thoroughly concur in what he has said.

I say, Mr. President, that the purpose to adhere to the World Court may have been in the minds, secretly, of the drafters of Resolution 192, but by no fair import can it be presumed by those who do not have access to their secret sentiments and expressions to have been considered.

Mr. President, is the United States of America to lag behind the rest of the world forever in the provision or in the honest effort to provide for social institutions which will be the alternative to the social iniquity of war? This great, bold, brave, strong Nation; this Nation wherein reigns the supremacy of law and not the government of man; this Nation, which in theory is supposed to have been a leader in every humane movement on the globe, somehow or other has had its virility, its moral stamina, sapped by some strange apathy, and it dares not utter a decent sentiment worthy of acceptance in the councils of world opinion. Yet, after all that has gone before, after the rejection of the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, after a 3-year fight one time and a 5-year fight another—the final recommendation for our adherence to the World Court came here the second time in 1930, and was rejected in 1935—after all the tragedy of that further failure to observe our obligations to the other nations and the world, today, in the midst of war, which many of us from our hearts believe is a direct

consequence of those failures, and the attitude which was responsible for those failures, now, instead of being penitent, instead of standing up and saying that if God and the dead will forgive us, the Senate of the United States will assume the moral leadership which this Nation should exhibit to the world, we are confronted with a measly, lukewarm, milk-and-water resolution intended to be obscure.

In Resolution 192 the framers have not seen fit to define the character of international authority which they propose. Not only have they failed to provide an affirmative function for it, that it be the instrumentality by which cooperation among the nations of the world might be promoted, not only has it been strangely silent about the establishment of institutions to settle peacefully international conflicts, but it leaves equally uncertain the question whether this authority which they propose shall have any power at all or not, nor does it leave the inference that it was intended to have power which I am sure Senators would never allow.

I refer to this language in the resolution, "with power"—that is, the organization shall have power—"to prevent aggression." Then the other words are "and to preserve the peace of the world."

Mr. President, what does that mean? What is the power in an international authority to prevent aggression? At what point will the power be exercised? By whom will it be wielded? What shall be the nature of the power? Against whom will it be asserted? Under what circumstances will it be invoked? Is the power limited, or is it illimitable? Does it include military force or not? Was it intended to be meaningless? one might fairly ask.

"With power to prevent aggression." Speaking of generality, speaking of breadth of authority and commission, speaking of the illimitable content in language, I know of no language which could be drafted which could possibly be broader than that.

Did the drafters mean that this organization of authority would have the power to go into the economies of the several nations, go into the school systems of the several States, scrutinize the industry and the economy of world powers, and stifle at their very inception the forces which later express themselves in military aggression? They say, "prevent aggression." They do not say, "military aggression." Do they mean to prevent economic aggression? If so, this authority might say the United States of America is reaching out dangerously to the forefront of world economy.

No, Mr. President, obviously they did not mean that. Yet they did not limit it. We do in our amendment. We say "to suppress military aggression." We thought that was probably as far as we should propose to go at the present time, to make it clear that it was only the force of arms which we proposed to stifle. We would by this international organization exercise a power to break up a forming mob of war mongers. We

clarify it in our amendment, but Resolution 192 leaves the matter completely uncertain.

Mr. President, I have spoken about the possible breadth of construction. Again let us observe the resolution's narrowness. Does it mean that military force will be used if necessary to prevent aggression? It does not say so. We certainly were not willing to adhere to article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which envisaged the use of military force if necessary. Is the Senate being told by its committee that we should advocate adherence to article X of the League of Nations, to article XI, and article XVI? Have we come now to be ready to use military force? The resolution does not say so, Mr. President. Certainly no one fairly reading the proposal would be advised that it is our intention to do so. When I said a bit ago that the broad language of Senate Resolution 192 might give this international authority power to stifle economic aggression, it is only fair to say that it might have the power also to suppress political aggression, and that might be construed to mean any kind of leadership by a nation in world affairs.

So we have made it distinct, Mr. President, in our proposed amendment. We do mean, if necessary, to use military force, and by military force we mean any kind of armed strength which a nation may manifest, not of course just that which we call military as distinguished from naval or air, but any kind of a strength which is a part of the armed power of a modern state.

Mr. President, I say this peculiar resolution is strangely contradictory. It speaks of power to prevent aggression without the slightest suggestion of the outline of that power. Yet it could well mean that its sponsors propose to exercise only some mild persuasion or some gentle economic sanction, which had been a failure in stopping World War No. 2 now bloodying the earth and massacring mankind. That, Mr. President, is the resolution behind which we are supposed to mobilize world moral opinion. That is what the United States Senate tells its citizenry and its soldiers we shall commit ourselves to in the desperate effort to stave off World War No. 3 and preserve the peace that they shall win.

I have here, Mr. President, but I shall not go into them in detail, two advisory resolutions which were given by the Senate in the years 1920 and 1929. The first one was on the 14th of December, 1920, submitted in the Senate by Senator Borah of Idaho. It reads as follows:

Whereas a representative and official of the Japanese Government has advised the world that the Japanese Government could not consent even to consider a program of disarmament on account of the naval building program of the United States; and

Whereas by this statement the world is informed and expected to believe that Japan sincerely desires to support a program of disarmament, but cannot in safety to herself do so on account of the attitude and building program of this Government; and

Whereas the only navies whose size and efficiency require consideration on the part

of this Government in determining the question of the size of our Navy are those of Great Britain and of Japan, two Governments long associated by an alliance; and

Whereas the United States is now and has ever been in favor of a practical program of disarmament: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to advise the Governments of Great Britain and Japan, respectively, that this Government will at once take up directly with their Governments and without waiting upon the action of any other nation the question of disarmament, with a view of quickly coming to an understanding by which the building naval programs of each of said Governments, to wit, that of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States, shall be reduced annually during the next 5 years 50 percent of the present estimates or figures.

Second, that it is the sense of the Congress, in case such an understanding can be had, that it will conform its appropriation and building plans to such agreement.

Resolved further, That this proposition is suggested by the Congress of the United States to accomplish immediately a substantial reduction of the naval armaments of the world.

Mr. President, that was a forthright declaration proposed to and enacted by the Senate of the United States. Later on in 1929 another resolution was adopted in the Senate. The resolution as adopted was the language of an amendment submitted by Senator Reed of Missouri to language proposed by Senator Borah, and is as follows:

First. That the Congress favors a treaty, or treaties, with all the principal maritime nations regulating the conduct of belligerents and neutrals in war at sea, including the inviolability of private property thereon.

Second. That such treaties be negotiated if practically possible prior to the meeting of the conference on the limitation of armaments in 1931.

There we have two instances where the Senate took advantage of its constitutional right to advise the Executive and to declare the policy of the Government with respect to international affairs. Was there ever such a challenge to the Government to do that as there is now? There is in progress in Moscow a conference among three of the principal United Nations. I ask Senators, and I do not disclose any lack of authority to the enemy, because they are informed of our institutions—surely now the whole world knows what the Senate can do—I ask Senators what can our poor Secretary of State agree to that will bind this Government in the absence of action by the Senate of the United States? If the President were there seated with the Prime Ministers of Britain and Russia in earnest consultation about the pattern of the post-war world, whether he be Republican or Democrat or of some other party affiliation, I ask Senators what could that troubled Executive say in the absence of a sentiment expressed authoritatively by the Senate of the United States?

I say, Mr. President, that the time has come for the American people to know the sordid truth, that unless the Senate of the United States is willing to commit itself under God that it will not abuse the power it possesses by its technical

machinery to throttle international treaty, and unless it pledges itself to the country that it will not abuse the privilege of unlimited debate permissible under its rules, unless it gives a covenant to the Nation that it will not take advantage of the two-thirds requirement for the ratification of treaties, unless the Senate of the United States voluntarily is willing to do that, the American people might as well now know that World War No. 3 is destined to come, because the Senate is not going to ratify any treaty setting up effective machinery which will keep the world peace. And I make it as a sad prediction and a sorrowful prophecy, the Senate is not going to ratify a decent and effective international world organization after the war.

Mr. President, let the people beware. Let the people beware.

Oh, Mr. President, if only there could have been some prescient eye, if there could have been some omniscient mind in the midst of World War No. 1 who could have come to the Senate and said, "Senators, I saw men die yesterday. Senators, men are going to die tomorrow in Belleau Woods, in the Argonne, in the Meuse River territory. I have seen the orders. I know the campaign. I should like to carry a message of assurance from the Senate of the United States before they die. Shall they die in vain?"

Mr. President, I should hate to have to take a message from the United States Senate to the soldiery of the United States of America upon the battle fronts of the world. What in the name of God could I tell them? What could the Secretary of State tell them, and what could the President tell them?

When President Woodrow Wilson, bearing upon his shoulders and in his heart the hope of the earth, sat for 6 months and formulated a decent treaty, which included an effective world organization, and came back to the Senate, he was treated more like a public enemy almost than the enemy itself by some Members of that body, so bitter were they in their political animosity to him. They relished the sight of his broken body. The only thing that disturbed them was the fact that they could not conquer his unconquerable spirit. Though he died wasted in body, that dominant purpose was just as clear, that spiritual dominance as mighty and superior, as it was when kings bowed to his step and when oppressed mankind tearfully humbled themselves before his magnificent prophecy and leadership. It was only in the United States Senate that he was unappreciated. It was only in the Foreign Relations Committee that he was demeaned, save on the dirty platforms of opponents who willed to destroy him for political purposes. And I am not so sure, Mr. President—at least, we have done nothing to give any confidence to any yearning heart that looks to us for solace—that we are not going to do the same thing again.

I do not believe that the members who wrote this resolution were timid of themselves—not all of them—but there is an unseen hand which has clutched the pen of those who strove to write this resolution. Whenever they reached

with bold stroke to strike out the brave words there were whisperings of isolationists, there were whisperings of political controversy, there were doubts as to whether the Senate would take it or not.

Mr. President, not failure, but low aim, is crime. If any Senator is not in favor of an effective world organization he has the power, whether he has a moral right or not, to say so. What is to be gained by deceiving anyone? Why not let all know our sentiments? Yet we all know that this resolution is one of appeasement to some opposition which they dare not arouse.

Will the resolution destroy that opposition? Will it emasculate the controversy which they so much fear? No, Mr. President; all it will do, is to afford a political umbrella to those who might like to get out of the rain of public indignation next year or later. All it does, Mr. President, is to deceive ourselves and the credulous who might have overconfidence in what we really aspire to achieve.

Mr. President, I should like to say, since I have spoken on what has been said in the past, that it might not be inappropriate to quote something which was conceived—it is old to most of us—as early as 1842, a sight of a great soul which I wish might be as clear to the Senate. It is Tennyson's inspired vision:

For I dipt into the future,
Far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world,
And all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce,
Argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight,
Dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting,
And there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies
Grappling in the central blue;
Far along the world-wide whisper
Of the south wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples
Plunging thru the thunderstorm;
Till the war drum throbb'd no longer,
And the battle flags were furled
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world.
There the common sense of most
Shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber,
Lapt in universal law.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know the names of the proposed conferees.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from

Colorado that I talked to the distinguished chairman of the committee, and that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], suggested the following conferees—of course, the Chair names the conferees—but the following names have been suggested to the Chair:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Those Senators happen to be the ranking members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, those recommendations are entirely satisfactory to me. It is a little unusual for the motion to be made by the Senator from Alabama, inasmuch as the Senator from Colorado was delegated by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs to be the manager of the legislation on the floor of the Senate. I wanted to be certain that no Senator was being left out in the consideration of the proposed legislation in the conference.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that the reason why I acted in the matter was because of the request of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. He is detained at the present moment on important public business, and could not be here, and requested that I take this action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The explanation is entirely satisfactory, let me say to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 179, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The resolution would increase by \$5,000 the amount authorized to be expended by the Committee on Military Affairs, in line with the general resolution which was adopted in the early part of this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to consideration, and would support the measure if it were properly explained by the Senator. Why does the committee need \$5,000?

Mr. LUCAS. At the beginning of the session, as the Senator will remember, we appropriated for each committee the sum of \$5,000 for general expenses. The Military Affairs Committee has expended the \$5,000, and is asking for an additional \$5,000 for hearings and other necessary expenses of the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Was the \$5,000 heretofore appropriated the only appropriation made this year?

Mr. LUCAS. That is not the only appropriation which has been made for the Military Affairs Committee. In the beginning the general appropriation was \$5,000, but from time to time other resolutions have been reported from the Military Affairs Committee for special investigations. This resolution is in line with the general resolutions making appropriations to Senate committees. The Committee on Military Affairs has expended the \$5,000 which was appropriated at the beginning of the session, and is now requesting more.

I have withheld this resolution for some time. I do not see the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee present in the Chamber, but the clerk of the committee informs me that the committee is in dire need of additional money to carry on the work of that important committee.

Mr. McNARY. Has the Senator's committee reported favorably?

Mr. LUCAS. It has.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 179) submitted by Mr. REYNOLDS on September 14, 1943, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 32, agreed to January 14, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to hold hearings during the Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by \$5,000.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—EXPENSES OF H. C. LOWRY IN CONNECTION WITH CONTEST

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 162, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I hope the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], whom I saw in the Chamber a moment ago, will return to the Chamber. He is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections which reported the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the able Senator specify the purpose of this resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the amount stated in the resolution, \$381.33, is for the payment of expenses incurred by one of the attorneys for those who protested against the seating of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The claim has been pending for some time. The subcommittee of the Com-

mittee on Privileges and Elections, headed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], held hearings on this claim and recommended that the attorney be paid.

Mr. McNARY. Is this the last amount of money we will be asked to appropriate in the matter of the charges against the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I think this is the last. I certainly hope it is the last.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 162) reported by Mr. GREEN from the Committee on Privileges and Elections on June 28, 1943, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee, such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding \$381.33, for the payments of expenses incurred by H. C. Lowry in connection with the contest of the seat in the Senate from the State of North Dakota now occupied by Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

Mr. BURTON obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment? I understand he is about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Ohio is to speak next, so I understand, but I think he would be willing to allow me to proceed for 5 or 6 minutes at the outside. I do not insist on having a quorum present when I speak, but I think a quorum should be present when the Senator from Ohio speaks. He has been very gracious about the matter of permitting me to speak for a few minutes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am sure it is the intention to have a quorum present to listen to the able junior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have a quorum present for the Senator from Ohio. My speech is not sufficiently important to justify calling for a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, after the able senior Senator from Tennessee has concluded his remarks, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much, and I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I am going to vote for the Connally resolution looking to an agreement to be signed by the peaceful nations after the war to keep the peace of the world. It is a simple, well-worded forthright expression of our intentions, and I believe has no hidden or uncertain meaning. Apparently, it says what it

means and means what it says, and stops there.

I had thought very well of the Fulbright resolution and the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution; but after listening to my distinguished and earnest friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], day before yesterday, I would certainly be opposed to either of those resolutions. It seems that the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution must have something hidden in it, judging from the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. He is opposed to the Connally resolution because it is "so vague and general as to leave every individual Member free in his own conscience to advocate, support, or oppose whatever interpretation might suit him in the future." I quote the exact words of the Senator from Minnesota. I wonder if there was something hidden in the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is upholding and which would prevent us from voting what in our own conscience we believe we should advocate, support, or oppose when the peace terms come before us for consideration. If there is, it ought not to be there. I am sure the Senator does not intend to have anything hidden there.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator permit me to finish my thought? Then I shall be glad to yield.

If I thought the Connally resolution had in it a hidden meaning of any kind that I could be accused of not living up to because of any particular interpretation of it, I would not vote for it. I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for bringing up the question. I think if ever there was a time when every Senator should be free and untrammelled to vote as he believes is right, it is when the peace treaty comes before us for consideration after this war is over.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as one of the authors of the so-called B. H. resolution, I wish to assure the Senator from Tennessee that there is nothing hidden in that resolution which he would not support. Let me assure the Senator from Tennessee that I have read with more than ordinary interest of the part which he played on the floor of the Senate during the great debate over the League of Nations. As a member of his party, I am proud of the stand which the Senator from Tennessee took at that time, and I have no doubt that the Senator from Tennessee will work and vote as ably and as strongly when another peace treaty comes before the Senate as he did the last time.

I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that so far as we are concerned we have no doubts. The Senator from Tennessee does not need a resolution of any kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, to be on the safe side I am giving notice now that while I am supporting the Connally resolution I am doing so because I believe in what, on its face, it advocates. If there is any vague

or hidden meaning in it, I am not going to be bound by any such hidden meaning, but I am going to interpret the terms of the Connally resolution myself when it comes to agreeing to the peace terms.

Let me say to my friend from Minnesota, whom I admire very much, that I am greatly obliged to him for being so frank with the Senate as to state what is intended by the resolution which he espouses.

To be assured by the Senator from Minnesota that the Connally resolution leaves "every individual Member free in his own conscience to advocate, support, or oppose whatever interpretation might suit him in the future"—and I quote his exact words—makes me very much stronger for the Connally resolution. It is the highest praise which could be bestowed on the Connally resolution. I am for peace terms backed by force to make those terms effective; but to be bound in the future by somebody else's opinion as to what this or any other resolution means is something that I would not for a moment think of doing.

Mr. President, I was in the Senate during the last World War when very similar questions arose toward its close. I was very strongly for President Wilson's League of Nations. I believed then, and believe now, that if the United States had entered into that Covenant the world would not now be at war, and this Nation would not now be at war. I regretted the defeat of that great instrument then, and I regret it now.

It will be remembered that practically all the nations of the earth, including Great Britain, Italy, France, Germany, Austria, Poland, Russia, and nearly all the other nations signed the League of Nations Covenant and agreed among themselves to abide by its terms. We alone of the great nations stayed out. But all those nations, some of them our present allies and some of them our present enemies, refused to carry out the covenants to which they themselves then solemnly agreed. Under those circumstances it seems to me it should be apparent to all thinking persons that we should be exceedingly careful and guarded about our agreements during and after this war, and not be bound in advance by any general resolution except as it expresses our earnest hope and devout wish that we can agree upon some world arrangement that will effectively prevent future wars. Do Senators realize that that is all we have at stake in this war? We have nothing else at stake in this war but the permanent preservation of the peace.

If we are to aid in keeping the peace of the world—and, of course, we should aid—then our allies as well as our enemies should put in our hands such naval and air bases and make such agreements for adjoining land, sea, and air routes as will make our aid in keeping world peace effective. Our peace commissioners should ever keep this foremost in their minds.

We do not want to extend our own boundaries or to interfere with the boundaries of other nations; but if world peace is to be kept and if the United States is to pledge herself to aid in keeping it, we must have the necessary pro-

tected world air and sea bases, stations, and routes, wherever they may be, and to whomsoever they may now belong, with full and perpetual title thereto and sovereignty over them to the end that we may take a part in the policing of the world. We should not be put in the position of a policeman on the beat without a mace, a "billy," or a gun.

We fought a war before and bore the largest part of the costs thereof without any real return of the great sums we advanced our allies. We received no tangible benefits therefrom. Then we utterly lost the peace. This time we have spent tremendously greater sums, advanced to our allies far more than we did then, and therefore we must win the peace by seeing to it that there shall be no more wars. Prevention of future wars is all that we can gain out of this war. We must never again lose sight of that main fact. We must remain firm and unfettered at the peace table, so that we can better obtain a permanent and enduring peace. Otherwise we shall have spent in vain the blood and efforts of our boys and untold billions of money in two world wars.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I desire to be free and untrammelled when the peace comes, and if there is any hidden meaning in the resolution which we are asked to adopt, I am not going to be bound by it.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have finished my statement, and I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I know my rights. I am willing to yield for a moment. I wish to give the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] an opportunity to start his speech, concerning which agreement was reached earlier in the day. But I am not going to stand for long debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am entirely through, but shall be glad to answer if the Senator from Minnesota wishes to ask a question.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the able Senator from Tennessee quoted absolutely correctly a statement which I made last Monday. I wish to thank him for that. I think, however, that he was wrong in drawing the inference from the statement that there is any hidden meaning in the amendment which other Senators and I have submitted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not say that I drew such conclusion, but I mean to say that it put me on guard that that sort of an interpretation might be put on some language contained in the pending resolution, and for that reason I give notice that I shall not be bound by it.

Mr. BALL. I might say that the only purpose which I can see in the resolution now is to state the present position of the Senate of the United States. I may also state that if the resolution stated that position as clearly as the Senator from Tennessee has stated his position, I would support it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator with all my heart.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scrugham
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in approaching the discussion of this subject I do it with the thought that this is the one time when this resolution will be before the entire Senate; I do it with the thought that each Member of the Senate, whether he has served on the Committee on Foreign Relations or otherwise, in casting his vote would like to cast it in the light of such considerations as occur to any Member of the Senate at any time. Therefore, I am hopeful that even members of the subcommittee in reaching their conclusions on this measure will give careful consideration to each of the amendments which have been seriously presented on the floor, and, in the event that any of those amendments be adopted by a majority of the Senate, that they will then accept them and proceed to adopt the resolution as amended, because I believe it is clear that today, as the Secretary of State of the United States sits in conference with a foreign nation, it would be helpful to him to have a resolution of this kind adopted by the Senate, and it would be helpful to him to have it in as clear and explicit terms as it is possible to make it.

In support of the amendment to the resolution proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and 13 other Senators, including myself, I shall endeavor to demonstrate 4 propositions:

First. There is need now for a Senate resolution on the post-war foreign policy of the United States. I shall, under that heading, attempt to develop a number of general considerations which I do not believe have, as yet, been fully analyzed in our consideration of the subject in the Senate, and from which, I believe, flow the considerations that should influence us in passing upon the other propositions which I present.

Second. Senate Resolution 192, as reported by the committee fails to measure up to the need and opportunity of the time.

Third. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida and other Senators supplies what is most seriously needed in the resolution and is thoroughly consistent with the interests and needs of the country.

Fourth. It is vitally important to adopt immediately, by a substantial vote, the resolution, if so amended.

Senate Resolution 192, as reported by the committee, reads as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida and other Senators would change the last paragraph of the resolution so that that paragraph would read as follows:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted, in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. President, in our international relations today, we face fundamental responsibilities and opportunities in many ways comparable to the fundamental responsibilities and opportunities we faced in our interstate relations which led to our Declaration of Independence in 1776 and to our Constitution in 1787. Our responsibility and our opportunity are comparable to those of the men who met the extraordinary crises of those times with constructive measures fitted to the needs of those times. They blazed the trail which has demonstrated the soundness of their faith in God and man as the foundation on which this Nation was built. We will do well to steep ourselves in this faith as we face the issues of our time.

Considerable has been said in the debate in comparing our situation with that which existed in 1918. I prefer at this time to emphasize our relation to the situation as it existed in 1776 and 1787, at which time constructive action was taken by this Nation. The precise issues and the conditions are not now the same as they were then, but the faith and the principles which led our forefathers to meet their issues fearlessly and constructively are the same faith and the same principles upon which we should again base our conduct if we are to carry forward the crusade they began, and if we are to meet our crisis in the life of America as well as they met theirs. They did not dodge the issue, they met the issue. Let us catch their spirit and live up to their standards.

These are the times that try men's souls.
* * * Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation

with us—that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; 'tis dear-ness only that gives everything its value.

Tom Paine wrote those words in the crisis just before the American Revolution. Those words might well have been written this morning to inspire us to meet the difficulties of the present conflict. We must not think that we can maintain in the crisis of today the freedom for which we fight any more easily than were our forefathers able to protect it after they had won it. There is today the same need for that deep faith in God and in our fellow men that filled the Declaration of Independence, and that led to the constructive policy that has made America the hope of mankind. We must not scoff at the fundamental seriousness of the issue today. We must recognize it or we shall fail to meet our opportunity.

I shall quote briefly from the documents of those days so that we may derive inspiration from those sources, and then proceed on our own account to make decisions worthy of our forefathers, and also worthy of the opportunities which grow out of this great World War for independence now being fought. Our decisions must fit the new horizons of our time as well as their decisions fitted the new horizons of their time. Our great responsibility is both to make sure that we do not fail in our responsibility to preserve the gains made by our forefathers, and that we do not fail to develop, under the conditions of our own time, solutions consistent with the principles on which our Nation was founded. We will do well to refresh our recollection of those principles.

We will do well to read from the Declaration of Independence the declaration of faith and principles and be guided by them. As we read them in this Chamber now, it is for us to apply them to the conditions of 1943. We will find them valuable. Let us think of them as applied to the conditions of our fellow men and allies under the tyranny of Axis conquerors, who look to us in America for leadership in order that peace and freedom may be retained when it has been won.

I quote from the Declaration of Independence, but reading it in the light in which it would be read in any of the occupied territories:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends—

And here I refer to the Axis governments of today—

it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient

causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

I continue reading from the Declaration of Independence, but reading it in the light of the conditions of the world today, having in mind our example, and the conditions against which we are fighting. It continues:

But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

I call attention to the fact that today the forms of government of the world have twice in one generation brought about, or sought to bring about, an absolute despotism, and the obligation now falls upon us, as clearly as it did upon our forefathers years ago, to throw off such kinds of government as have brought about that condition, or made it possible.

The Declaration of Independence concludes:

And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Mr. President, the full breadth and the everlasting inspiration of these words in their relation to the fundamentals of our Government were restated 80 years later with extraordinary clearness by Abraham Lincoln. It will be well for us, after 75 years more, to catch the depth of meaning which Lincoln found in these words as we seek again to deal with the fundamentals for which we fight.

At Springfield, Ill., in 1857, in discussing this very clause of the Declaration of Independence Lincoln said:

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men equal—equal in certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This they said and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon.

Then Lincoln added:

They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and, even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence, and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere.

In the quotation I have just read I call attention to the emphasis which Lincoln placed upon the responsibility of future generations, which would include ours,

to apply the principles of our forefathers as far as circumstances will permit, and we face the new circumstances today. He emphasized that the responsibility of this Nation and its leaders was an everlasting responsibility, which depended upon those who succeeded to the trusteeship of our national powers to make sure that we continued to apply the principles with the same vision and vigor as did those who declared them in the first instance.

Discussing the same subject in 1858, Lincoln said of his forefathers and ours:

These by their representatives in old Independence Hall said to the whole race of men: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This was their majestic interpretation of the economy of the universe. This was their lofty, and wise, and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to His creatures—yes, gentlemen, to all His creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows: They grasped not only the whole race of man then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children, and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages.

I may well pause in my reading to say that we are now living in the age of "their children's children," and that "the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages" are facing the issue of slavery.

Wise statesmen as they were—

Lincoln continued—

they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future—

Which has now become the present—some man—

And there I would interpolate Hitler—some faction—

And I might interpolate, the Nazis—some interest—

And I might interpolate, the Axis—should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity—

That is our generation—

their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, so that truth and justice and mercy and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built.

There ends the quotation from Lincoln in 1858.

The foregoing words emphasize beyond all possibility of doubt the continuing force which Abraham Lincoln believed that the faith and principles of our Dec-

laration of Independence should have at all times in guiding the conduct of the American people. He uses the language in its true meaning as applicable to all humanity everywhere for all times. This undoubtedly was the meaning in which the language was used by the writers of the Declaration of Independence, for they regarded themselves as expressing in that document a divine philosophy as broad as humanity itself, of which our own experience in America was but one local expression. The important thing for us to realize is that which was so well realized by them and by Lincoln. It is that we must constantly be faithful to this principle in all our conduct if we are to be faithful to America. And yet, at the same time, in the words of Lincoln in 1857, it is equally important that we so gage our conduct that the enforcement of this right will follow as far as circumstances shall permit. We owe an obligation to retain the gains which we have made in the application of it and to expand those gains in accordance with its deepest meaning while at the same time so restraining ourselves that we shall not, by overeagerness or by impracticality, lose that which we have in seeking after unrealities. We must follow the middle course, but that does not mean the easy course or the course of inaction. We shall fail as greatly in our trusteeship if we do too little as if we do too much. We must neither bury our talents nor put them in the bank. We must develop them if we are to be good and faithful servants of America. We shall fail in our trusteeship if we do not advance to meet the opportunities of our time as our forefathers advanced to meet the opportunities of their time.

Lincoln, on his way to his inauguration in 1861, visited Independence Hall, and in that hall made the following memorable statement, again emphasizing the constructive force which he read into our Declaration of Independence, and which we equally should read into it today. It will help to guide us today. He said:

I am filled with deep emotion at finding myself standing here in this place, where were collected the wisdom and patriotism and devotion to principle from which sprang the institutions under which we live. You have kindly suggested to me that in my hands is the task of restoring peace to the present distracted condition of the country.

I may insert here—and how comparable is that to the task ahead of the Senate of restoring peace to the present distracted conditions of the world.

I can say in return, sir—

Continued Lincoln—

that all the political sentiments I entertain have been drawn so far as I have been able to draw them from the sentiments which originated and were given to the world from this hall. I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I have often pondered over the dangers which were incurred by the men who assembled here and framed and adopted that Declaration of Independence. I have pondered over the tolls that were endured by the officers and soldiers of the army who achieved that independence.

And then comes this striking sentence from the Lincoln statement made in Independence Hall:

It was not the mere matter of a separation of the Colonies from the motherland, but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but I hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men. This is the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Now, my friends, can this country be saved on this basis? If it can I will consider myself one of the happiest men in the world if I can help to save it. If it cannot be saved upon that principle, it will be truly awful. But if this country cannot be saved without giving up that principle, I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender.

Having in mind the devoted service of Lincoln's next 4 years and his assassination in Washington, this dedication of his to the principle of the Declaration of Independence and its relation to the world for all future time, has especially deep significance for us.

From this discussion it is clear that by declaring the right of every human being to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we have a foundation principle to guide us. Its application must be made clear first within our Nation, and our conduct on behalf of America must be consistent with its development throughout humanity. Our first responsibility is to preserve it here in America under the ever-changing conditions of this constantly developing world. Since the days of Jefferson, Washington, and Lincoln, there have been no developments which have changed the meaning of the principle. There have been great developments in the fields of transportation, communication, and international economic, social, and political relationships. These put upon us the responsibility of adjusting our own governmental machinery so as to keep up with the new conditions of our time. To this end I believe that a declaration of a post-war foreign policy for the United States calculated to preserve the peace of America and the principles of freedom for the individual will be helpful. I believe that the proposed declaration, Senate Resolution 192, as submitted in the Senate fails to meet this need. I believe that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators to that declaration will meet that need, and I believe that it is important in justice to our forefathers, to the present generation, and to the generations to come that we adopt the policy stated in such resolution as it will be stated if the pending amendment is agreed to.

Before undertaking to discuss the issue, however, I believe that we should derive inspiration not only from the Declaration of Independence, but from the Constitution of the United States and especially from the proceedings at the time of its development as a constructive step—and I emphasize "a constructive step" in the history of our country in meeting new conditions—and I emphasize "new conditions"—with an appropriate new solution—I emphasize "new

solution"—developed consistently with the principles of the Declaration of Independence and with the new issues then confronting our forefathers of their application of those principles.

One of the great and practical leaders in our colonial times was Benjamin Franklin. He was a businessman and inventor, a scholar, and in many ways a genius. He was much loved. He was a man of great practical common sense. He was also a man of deep faith in God and in his fellow men. He was a member of the Constitutional Convention. He took part in many of its deliberations. The ability of that convention to rise above personalities and petty and narrow considerations in order to reach high, constructive, and bold conclusions based upon tolerance and devotion to the welfare of the Nation, as contrasted with any of its parts, reflects the influence of Benjamin Franklin. In Madison's notes of the proceedings of June 28, 1787, in the Constitutional Convention we have the record of a famous statement by Benjamin Franklin which might well be read into the Record of our proceedings and of the debate at this time. He said:

Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks' close attendance and continual reasonings with each other—our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes, is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom since we have been running about in search of it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that I do not desire to delay the proceedings at all. The Senator from Ohio is making a very able and a very constructive speech, one which may well affect the destiny of this Nation. I should like to have a larger attendance of Senators on the floor. For that reason I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scrugham
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, preceding the quorum call I was speaking under the heading "There is need now for a Senate resolution on the post-war foreign policy of the United States." I was referring to the somewhat similar situation which existed at the time of the presentation of a new Constitution in this country, so far as the present situation raises difficult issues and confronts us with new conditions, calling for new solutions.

In that connection, I was about to read a quotation from Benjamin Franklin, who was a member of the Constitutional Convention. On June 28, 1787, he said:

Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks' close attendance and continual reasonings with each other—our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We, indeed, seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those republics which having been formed with the seeds of their own dissolution no longer exist. And we have viewed modern states all round Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances.

In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings, that "except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this, and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel: We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.

"I, therefore, beg leave to move—that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business."

It is with this breadth of vision, with this readiness to consider the suggestions of all Members of the deliberative body as well as the suggestions of those submitting an original proposal, with this

willingness to adopt new and constructive measures and above all with this depth of faith in God and in man that guided the Convention of 1787 that we must consider the issues of today. We must lift them far above all questions of partisanship, personalities, and prejudices if we are to reach an answer as nearly right and as closely consistent with the principles of our Declaration of Independence as did our forefathers.

In reaching the momentous conclusions which the members of the Constitutional Convention reached they faced many problems dealing with limitations which they found necessary to impose upon those free and sovereign States in order to provide for the best interests and safety of them all. As a result of the approval of the several sovereign States of the terms of the new Constitution, we today have an outstanding example of the wise use of the sovereign powers of those States for their common welfare. Any contract into which an individual enters, binds him to an obligation which restricts his freedom of action to the extent of the terms of that contract. In return he receives some consideration in the form of acts or obligations of others which makes it worth while for him to enter the contract. He still remains a free and self-respecting individual and through his contractual agreements he has gained new resources while also assuming new obligations.

So the sovereign States which accepted the Constitution of the United States have still retained their sovereignty, although voluntarily limiting its scope to the extent agreed upon in the Constitution in consideration of the benefits derived from the Constitution. Through the exercise of this right of contract the several States, or perhaps more accurately, the people of the several States, have added greatly to their own lasting freedom and security. It is entirely a question of discretion as to what extent and in what manner this right of contract should be exercised.

In accepting the Constitution of the United States of America, the sovereign States found it to be to their advantage to go much further than usually will be the case in agreements between sovereign states. Experience, however, has many times over justified their unusual action in that particular case.

Now the United States of America in turn faces its own problem on lasting freedom and security in a world that has shrunk for many purposes of transportation and communication to an area comparable to the continental areas two centuries ago. To jump at the conclusion, however, that because of the success of the Constitution of the United States of America in meeting the novel problem of our Thirteen Sovereign States in 1787, a similar constitution will meet the novel problems of the nations of the world in 1943, is to fail to appreciate the tremendous differences between those situations with the same clarity that we may see the superficial similarities in those situations.

As trustees of America, our first duty is to America and to the people of America. America must yield nothing except

as she sees in it, in the light of all the circumstances, a corresponding benefit to America and to the people of America. She will do well also to assure herself that the step shall be consistent with the principles of her Declaration of Independence, and with her faith in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

On the other hand, if we are to be as true to the people of America, to the principles of the American Declaration of Independence, and to the cause of human freedom and security, we shall face the novel problems of our time with the same degree of candor, and the same depth of faith in God and in our own people, as did our forefathers in 1787.

If we are faithful to our trust, we shall look the new facts in the face and not hesitate to meet those new facts with such new policies as shall be fitted to them. We shall not attempt to feed oats to our national automobile.

We shall provide it with the best engine, the best fuel, and the best mechanical service we can find for it, and it probably will have some novel features to it if we are up to date.

It would be equally unfaithful to our trust either to declare now that we advise the creation forthwith of a United States of the World on our 1787 model, or to declare now that we advise that in spite of the tragedy of two world wars in one generation we shall not do anything substantially to change the course of the world that permitted those wars to occur.

To fail to recommend some constructive post-war foreign policy that will translate into action at least the primary lesson of the tragedies of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 is to default in the leadership placed in our hands. I believe that Senate Resolution 192, as submitted, does default in substantially that degree. I believe that the amendment here under consideration cures the default and meets the obligation imposed upon us, as I shall explain when considering its terms.

Our highest obligation can be met only if we can find those policies which will be of the greatest permanent benefit to the people of the United States of America. I believe that we can find them in a course of action thoroughly consistent with the principles of our Declaration of Independence, and of such a character that they will be of lasting benefit not only to the people of the United States of America, but to the other parties to the proposal and fundamentally in the interests of all humanity, including the people of the small as well as the large nations of the world.

We do not need and we should not attempt, at this time, to indicate the details of those policies. It will be helpful, however, to indicate with clarity certain fundamentals of those policies so that people of this Nation and of our allied nations, both large and small, may work together in this war and after this war with a deeper and greater understanding than is now the case.

To illustrate the thinking of George Washington along the lines of principle, as he concluded his services as the presiding officer of the Constitutional Convention, I quote from his letter of September 17, 1787, transmitting the draft of the Constitution to the United States in Congress assembled. He said:

It is obviously impracticable in the Federal Government of these States to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstance as on the object to be obtained. It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered and those which may be reserved, and on the present occasion this difficulty was increased by a difference among the several States as to their situation, extent, habits, and particular interests.

In all our deliberations on this subject we kept steadily in our view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American, the consolidation of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence. This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds, led each State in the Convention to be less rigid on points of inferior magnitude than might have been otherwise expected, and thus the Constitution which we now present is the result of a spirit of amity and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable.

That it will meet the full and entire approbation of every State is not perhaps to be expected, but each will doubtless consider that had her interest been alone consulted the consequences might have been particularly disagreeable or injurious to others; that it is liable to as few exceptions as could reasonably have been expected, we hope and believe; that it may promote the lasting welfare of that country so dear to us all, and secure her freedom and happiness is our most ardent wish.

Washington thus emphasized the necessity for giving up minor advantages in favor of a greater good and in favor of the constructive action agreed upon to solve the difficulties presented. The impressive thing is that the solution recommended was not one of colorless compromise. It resulted in the colorful conception of the "greatest single document ever struck off at any one time by the hand of man."

Of this document George Washington said:

If to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God.

The result of this policy at that time produced the Constitution. It saved and advanced the cause of self-government. Let us therefore in 1943 "raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair." Let us also have faith in God and in man.

Finally, Alexander Hamilton, in the first Federalist paper introduced the subject in a way which well expresses the fundamental importance of the issue facing the American people then and now. He said:

It has been frequently remarked that it seems to have been reserved to the people of

this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force. If there be any truth in the remark, the crisis at which we are arrived may with propriety be regarded as the era in which that decision is to be made; and a wrong election of the part we shall act may, in this view, deserve to be considered as the greatest misfortune of mankind.

Mr. President, it is in the light of the example of these men and of these declarations of principle and of procedure that we can best approach our responsibility to our Nation in declaring its international policy now. We will do well to use the vision and the perspective of these men as we seek to discharge our modern trusteeship of the principles and our trusteeship of the interests of the Nation which they established. While we must safeguard the gains of our people, we must be sure that we do not belittle those gains or stunt their future growth. We must not look through the telescope from the large end into the little end as we examine the still distant future in which our forefathers were so deeply interested and for which they planned with such constructive wisdom and unbounded faith. We must use the telescope as they did, look far into the future, and steer a straight and bold course, guided by the same star of liberty and the same star of hope by which they chose their course. Today the helm is in our hands. The time for hesitancy has passed. The time calls for candor, clarity, courage, and continued faith in the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The event is in the hand of God, and America is His instrument.

I. THERE IS NEED NOW FOR A SENATE RESOLUTION ON THE POST-WAR FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, I propose to demonstrate that there is need now for a Senate resolution on post-war foreign policy by developing two propositions. Both are fundamentally important and each can be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt. One is that there should be post-war planning going on now, participated in by the United States Government, including the United States Senate. The other is, that there should be expression given now to the fundamental post-war foreign policy of the United States Senate.

A. THERE SHOULD BE POST-WAR PLANNING GOING ON NOW, PARTICIPATED IN BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Our first and consuming obligation is to devote ourselves to planning and winning the war completely in both hemispheres. Nothing can take the primary place of this obligation. Nothing that we may do, either as to post-war planning or in any other field can be permitted to interfere with the performance of this obligation. If we are to undertake post-war planning, it must be so done that it contributes to the unity of the United Nations in the war and to the

winning of the war. I am confident that post-war planning of great value can be and should be done within that limitation.

We must win the war completely in both hemispheres or we shall not have the peace which we seek and for which we plan. On the other hand, if we win the fighting and have no plans beyond that point, we may well find that, within the United States and within the Western Hemisphere, as well as in the balance of the world, we shall not retain the peace which we shall have won. Furthermore, in order that the peace may be worth the infinite price which will be paid for it, it must be a just, a lasting, and a living peace that will adapt itself to the changing conditions of many years to come.

It is easy, but unsound, to say that we must devote our entire time to winning the war now, and that we will take up the peace when the war is over and peace has come. Life is not so simple as that. The sound planning of man-made advances cannot be left to hurried improvisation. A habit of improvisation may be thoughtless in personal affairs; it is treason to humanity in world affairs. It is as great a crime on the part of a government to permit its people to drift into an emergency without carefully prepared plans to meet it, as it is for a commanding general to permit his troops to drift into a military emergency without carefully prepared plans to meet it. In modern warfare, it is impossible to leave successful battle plans to improvisation. Not only is time needed for thinking out the best solution; time is needed to provide the logistics. The same is true to an even greater extent in the complicated field of modern international economic, social, and political progress.

The term "logistics" is comparatively new in civilian vocabulary. In military terms it embraces the details of the transport, quartering, and supply of troops. In global warfare this is now a major and often a deciding factor between overwhelming success and disastrous defeat. On most of our fighting fronts there must be 6 months or more of planning and preparation before a military action can be launched on a successful and substantial scale. How much more necessary it is, then, that there be a year or more of planning and preparation for the economic, social, and political stability of the post-war world. A general who failed to make the necessary advance plans and preparations for a large-scale military movement would be so delinquent in his duty to his country that he would be relieved of his command as soon as this failure was known. Those responsible for the governmental leadership of this Nation in its economic, social, and political development owe no less a duty to the public to plan and prepare for the Nation's post-war policies. It is these post-war policies that will determine whether our Nation and the world will be able to enjoy after the war the freedom and the peace which the armies will have won. Failure to make these plans and preparations can force upon this Nation, and upon the world,

such economic, social, and political collapse and chaos as will result in a regimentation and totalitarian control so strict as to cause the United Nations to wonder whether they did not lose instead of win the war against totalitarianism and dictatorship.

It has been well said by former President Herbert Hoover and former Ambassador Hugh Gibson, in their book *The Problems of Lasting Peace*, that "nations can blunder into war. They cannot blunder into peace." This is common sense. It states an important distinction between war and peace. War is much like an explosion or a disaster. It can result from many kinds of blunders or accidents. Peace, on the other hand, is more like a building. It must have a firm foundation. It must be well planned. It must have good specifications. It must be skillfully built. After it is built, it must be carefully maintained. Otherwise, we cannot have a beautiful or useful building. Yet, if the building has firm foundations, good plans, good specifications, is skillfully built and carefully maintained, it can be of great beauty and of great use. It can be an important contribution to the welfare of mankind. Peace, like a building, is a man-made product. Peace can only be of great value if it rests on firm foundations, is well planned in general and in detail, is skillfully constructed, and is carefully maintained.

No general can wait to plan or prepare for his next campaign until after his current campaign is complete. He must fight his present campaign and plan and prepare for his next campaign at the same time. He even must think several campaigns ahead and be ready for all possible alternative situations. Likewise, if we are to have a successful peace after the war, we must plan for it and prepare for it during the war. Industry, labor, agriculture, and the Government, including the Senate of the United States, have a primary responsibility to plan for the post-war period. If the war had ended in Europe a month or two ago, or if it should end in Europe today or tomorrow, neither industry, labor, agriculture, nor our Government, including the Senate of the United States, would be ready for the emergency.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I was very much interested in the parallel the Senator has been drawing, and his conclusion that the same degree of advance planning and preparation is necessary for the success of any program to maintain peace in the world as is essential for success in planning for a military campaign.

I think there is perhaps one difference the Senator has not pointed out as much as he might, namely, the fact that, while a general in command of an army can make his plans, and no one can interfere with him, and when he issues his orders they go through; on the other hand, in this democratic Republic, the Government can make plans to maintain the peace, once we have won, but those plans can be carried out only if

they are supported, approved, and ratified by the American people, and by their representatives in the United States Senate. That, I believe, is why it is so extremely important that the Senate give the American people clear, concrete leadership in indicating the direction in which we believe now lies the best hope for the future peace of the world.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his emphasis on that point, which of course carries with it an indication that there is a great need for time to accomplish that extra step involved in self-government, for consideration by the people and their representatives.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was very much taken by the able Senator's figure of speech comparing the situation to a building. I think every Senator agrees that we want a very fine house, a beautiful house, a highly functional house, but I think every Senator is also interested in these questions—where is the house to be, how many rooms are there to be in it, what is the exposure of the house to be, who is going to be the architect of the house, and who is going to occupy the master bedroom? I trust the Senator will illuminate his figure of speech a little further along those lines in relation to the amendment which he is sponsoring.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Colorado. The point he makes is of course one which is clear, and which will be emphasized as I go along, that we are not now writing the treaty of peace, we are not now publishing the blueprints, which will come at a later stage, but we are now making the preliminary plans, and we are now making a start with the decision that we shall have a house.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think we are all agreed that we should have a house. I think that in giving our sketch here, if we may call this a sketch that we are working on, we have to have in mind the kind of house we really want, the kind of house we expect to live in. A mere abstract architect's first sketch is a rather useless thing. Any good housewife planning a house is thinking about her closets, thinking about the basement, thinking about where the furnace is to be, thinking about where the washing machine is to be, thinking about the exposures, thinking about just how the house is to be set on the lot, thinking about the arrangement of the rooms, thinking about the electrical connections, and so forth and so on. The Senator is giving a general direction, but until someone else shall then give a more detailed sketch, I doubt if we are doing anything except that which is quite futile.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator is dealing with the blueprints. The items the Senator is speaking of, with which the housewife is so much concerned, appear in the blueprint stage, and there is a point where generalities do not serve any beneficial purpose. I am attempting to indicate, and I shall indicate, that there are two particulars which should be included in any expression of a Senate

policy at this time, and those two are missing from the resolution, but are contained in the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I hope the Senator will develop this subject, and during his illuminating and able address will relate his references to the declarations of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution having to do with human liberty to the amendment which he is sponsoring.

Mr. BURTON. I may say that the reason why those declarations were emphasized was because of the consideration of the Declaration of Independence during the deliberations that went into the drafting of the Constitution. During the drafting of the Constitution the striking thing was that the members of the convention were faced with a novel situation involving some agreements affecting the sovereignty of the States, and they did not hesitate to make a straightforward, constructive solution. I may add that in the light of their experience with the same principles behind us, we face this issue, and I have pointed out clearly that I do not believe it is the same set of circumstances. I do not believe we should be setting up a United States of the world, but I do believe we should be as ready to examine into the precise conditions of our times and as ready to apply novel and practical considerations to meet them as our forefathers were to meet the conditions of their times.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senator has quite eloquently emphasized the ideology of the Declaration of Independence. The Senator opened his address with emphasis on that. I was hoping and I have been waiting for him to tie that in to the particular amendment which he sponsors. The reason I am interested in it is that of course we all know there is not a democracy south of the Rio Grande. We also know that China is not a democracy. We also know that Russia is not a democracy. I am wondering how we can amalgamate and work something constructive out of those conflicting ideologies which were not present in the making of the Constitution.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, that is why I endeavored to make it clear—and I am happy the Senator brought up the point—that of course there is a grave danger in going too far. The point is to go as far as circumstances require, but still continually having in mind the principle upon which this Nation has been built and the value which that principle is in the world today.

We were a little Nation in those days, and we fought our way in spite of that fact. Today there are many little nations in the world and many large nations. Two great wars have been fought in our time which were brought about by an attempt to enslave the world.

Mr. President, I believe the people of our time are moved by the same sentiments which moved our forefathers in the days of the Declaration of Independence. But, in the light of our own experience, I urge that we keep the results of our own experiment clearly in view. We want that to be a beacon

light to the world. We want to show the smaller nations of the world that we are sympathetic to them as others were sympathetic to us in our early years.

I do not mean to attempt to impose upon others what they do not wish. I do not mean to talk about an empire of the United States. I do mean that our responsibility is to keep fully alive and vigorous the principles of the Declaration of Independence in order that others may see them, and that we shall do nothing in conflict with those principles, but to tie them in closely with the present day. I believe that if today we fail in our great leadership to safeguard the peace of the future we shall fail to do our duty as the custodians of those principles, and shall unnecessarily subject ourselves and the world to a repetition of the imposition of the tyranny of the past.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio allow me to read from a quotation which might have some bearing on the question under debate?

Mr. BURTON. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Colorado has, of course, posed a very important question. I should like to read two or three paragraphs from a very remarkable speech delivered on September 22, 1933, by the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Maxim Litvinov, who was the representative of the Soviet Union at the League of Nations and spoke at the League of Nations assembled in Geneva, as Senators will note, just a few days before Munich. Here are two or three paragraphs which I think have a bearing upon, and answer to, the question the able Senator from Colorado asks. Mr. Litvinov said:

After long doubts and hesitations, the Soviet Union joined the League—

Referring to the League of Nations—in order to add the strength of its 170,000,000 people to the forces of peace. In the present hour of bitter disillusionment, the Soviet Union is far from regretting this decision, if only because there would undoubtedly have otherwise been attempts to attribute the alleged impotence and collapse of the League to its absence.

But having entered the League, it has been unflinchingly loyal to the League obligations which it undertook and has faithfully performed and will endeavor to continue to carry out all the decisions and recommendations of the League directed to preserving peace and combatting aggression, irrespective of whether those decisions coincided with its immediate interests as a state.

The concluding paragraph of this very remarkable speech is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the Soviet Government takes pride in the fact that it has not acceded to such a policy—

That is, the policy of appeasement which other nations have accorded—

and has invariably pursued the principles set forth by the League of Nations, which were approved by almost every nation in the world; nor has it any intention of abandoning them for the future, being convinced that in the present conditions it is impossible otherwise to safeguard a genuine peace and genuine international justice. It falls upon other governments likewise to return to this policy.

Mr. President, I thought it might have some bearing upon the Senator's question to show that in 1938, before Munich, the Soviet Union, as its Foreign Minister says in his speech, advised Czechoslovakia that the Soviet Union was ready to honor its obligations. It called upon the western powers not to permit the collective security of the League of Nations collapse, and Mr. Litvinov pointed out the catastrophe which would follow.

So to be perfectly frank, the record of Russia for international collaboration, at least until the collapse of the League of Nations, is equally as good as that of any other principal nation in the world.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to permit me to impose upon him just a little further?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe it is not entirely pertinent, but it might throw further interesting background upon what the Senator has just said if I were to read very briefly from the history of the Holy Alliance. May I do that, I ask the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BURTON. I shall be glad to have the Senator to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I read from the Encyclopaedia Britannica, volume 11, page 683, as follows:

THE HOLY ALLIANCE

The famous declaration known by this name was signed in the first instance by Alexander I, Emperor of Russia, Francis I, Emperor of Austria, and Frederick William III, King of Prussia, on September 26, 1815.

This document, the text of which was not published until 1816, laid down—

I invite the Senator's especial attention to the high order of ideology involved in the proclamations connected with the Holy Alliance—

laid down that the reciprocal relations of the powers were henceforth to be based on the sublime truths which the holy religion of our Saviour teaches; that the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace * * * must have an immediate influence on the councils of princes, and guide all their steps; that the three monarchs would, accordingly, remain united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity and on all occasions and in all places, lend each other aid and assistance, while regarding themselves toward their subjects and armies as fathers of families (art. I); that the said governments and their subjects would consider themselves as members of one and the same Christian nation (art. II). In the last article (III) all the powers who should choose solemnly to avow the sacred principles which have dictated this act were invited to join this Holy Alliance.

Mr. President, that originated from the Emperor of Russia. I will omit some of the details of further history of the Holy Alliance, and simply come to the conclusion:

As a diplomatic instrument the Holy Alliance never became effective. Nonetheless, its principles and the fact of its signature had a powerful effect during the nineteenth century. It strongly influenced Nicholas I of Russia, to whom the brotherhood of sovereigns by divine right was an article of faith, inspiring the principles of the Convention of Berlin (between Russia, Austria, and Prussia) in 1833, and the Czar's intervention in 1849

to crush the Hungarian insurrection on behalf of his brother of Austria. That it had become synonymous with a conspiracy against popular liberties was, however, a mere accident of the point of view of those who interpreted its principles. It was capable of other and more noble interpretations, and it was avowedly the inspiration of the famous rescript of the Emperor Nicholas II which resulted in the first international peace conference at The Hague in 1899.

I thought that would be somewhat of a contribution to the discussion of the history of Russia's ideology in these matters.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator is not recommending that as a pattern, I assume.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Colorado has spoken of an ideology which came into being in 1815 through an alliance of nations. From what the able junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] said a few minutes ago, and in reading the remarkable speech made by Maxim Litvinov, there was brought to my mind this current true fact: When Hitler in 1938 marched with his legions to the border of Czechoslovakia they were stopped by the Czech Army. Dr. Eduard Benes was President of that Republic at that time. The Czechs had the greatest army in Europe, with the possible exception of the Russian and the German Armies. It will be recalled that Hitler and his army did not make an attack upon Czechoslovakia then. Czechoslovakia is almost as much of a republic as our country is. Its constitution is patterned after the Constitution of the United States. It had freedom of worship, freedom of press, freedom of speech, and all the other unalienable rights which were guaranteed in our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

In that crisis, who was the friend of Czechoslovakia? Who was the real friend who came to the rescue of Czechoslovakia? It was Russia. Call her a Communist nation, if you will; but she stood by the side of that republic. In that republic lived men and women who were free. They believed in a theory of government entirely different from the theory of government believed in by the Russian people; but in that crisis the friend of Czechoslovakia was Russia, and Stalin told Benes that if the Czechoslovakian Army would stand and fight the Nazi Army when Czechoslovakia was attacked, Russia would come to her rescue. That is current history; that is a fact. I present it here because the issue based on ideologies has been raised. In other words, Russia's position relative to Czechoslovakia in 1938 is a clear-cut demonstration that Russia in the post-war era, in my humble opinion, will sit by the side of a government of democratic form, such as our own and such as Czechoslovakia, and will deal with the other nations of the earth on fair and equitable terms. She wants a just and lasting peace, the same as all other Allied Nations do.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I should merely like to have it clear in the RECORD

at this point that I appreciate the discussion. I desire to reiterate the fact that the point I am arguing is that the ideology of the United States Government, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, I believe is adequate for our purpose; that I believe we can afford to uphold it as the basis of our future philosophy, and that it gives plenty of room for us to deal with any other nation in the world. I am merely asking that in applying that ideology to the world we shall be consistent to our own ideology and shall adapt it to the needs of the time, and the needs of the time change from century to century.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will go further than the Senator from Illinois has gone, and will say that Russia not only proved herself a friend of Czechoslovakia, but she has proved herself a friend of the entire Allied world.

I will go further. The point I was making is that I was fearful that the Senator from Ohio was making his base so strictly an ideological one that automatically we would be precluded from any sort of cooperation with any of the other nations of the world except the democracies, and they are too few for any sort of organization.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I am happy the Senator gave expression to those thoughts. The United States of America, of course, has dealt with the other nations of the world throughout its life, and I believe our ideology is strong enough so that we can afford to do business with every other nation in the world. We are fighting on the same side with Russia and are glad to have Russia fighting on the same side with us; and I believe it will be agreed that one of the principles of our ideology is to remain active in connection with all the other nations in the world in peace as well as in war.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes, Mr. President; and I believe the Senator will agree that, if we have a right to proselyte them as to their ideologies, they have a perfect right to proselyte us as to ours, and that would lead to war, not peace.

Mr. BURTON. I am glad the Senator has raised that point. I am arguing that the United States, in moving for world peace, should cling to its internal policies and, as we deal with the world, still cling to our internal policies and our ideology in relation to the world. In that I believe there is a beacon of light to which many of the people of this country would wish to look and in which they would find much encouragement. I am not seeking to proselyte. I am seeking to continue along the straight and narrow path for which our forefathers fought, and to which we should be dedicated today.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator for permitting the interruption.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his contribution.

Mr. President, if the war had ended in Europe a month or two ago, or if it should end in Europe today or tomorrow, neither

industry, labor, agriculture, nor our Government, including the Senate of the United States, would be ready for the emergency.

We should already have developed our work on this throughout America to a greater extent than we have done so. It is not too late to do better, but there is no time to be lost.

In whatever we do in industry, labor, agriculture, or the Government, including the Senate of the United States, to plan and prepare for the post-war period, we must do it in a way that will bind our Nation together and will bind ourselves and our allies together in fighting the war. To do otherwise would be to become our own enemies. Therefore, it remains for us to find ways of doing this work that will strengthen, rather than weaken, our military efforts. This can be done by greater cooperation within America, between industry, labor, agriculture, and government. If we will only have greater faith in each other and work together, our Nation will be stronger for it, and the Allied cause will be stronger for it.

The Senate can contribute to it by clarifying its post-war foreign policies. This avoids confusion and gives leadership. It substitutes directness for indirection. It provides positive progress in place of rather hesitant drift, it seems to me. The best way to do this now will be to agree to the pending clarifying amendment proposed by the 14 Senators, and to adopt by an overwhelming vote the resolution as amended.

Therefore, we must fight our way across the one-way bridge to military victory. No general, however, would plan to capture a bridge merely so as to seize the bridgehead on the other side. He would capture it so as to go somewhere from the other side. Before he captured it, he would plan where and how he would go beyond it. So in this instance, we must plan where we shall go in peace, after victory on the battlefield. I see three roads to lasting peace. Each calls for the careful planning and preparation of our advance along it. The first is the road to post-war internal stability within the United States. The second is the road to post-war regional stability within the Western Hemisphere. The third is the road to post-war world-wide stability. A separate examination of each of these three roads will demonstrate the benefits that can flow from planning and preparing our advance along them.

INTERNAL STABILITY—WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Our internal stability within the United States for years to come will be vital to ourselves. Also, it will be vital as an important element in world-wide stability. In addition, it will stand as an outstanding good or bad example of the practice of the principles we have preached since 1776.

As America turns from the governmentally financed war production of her first total war to the far freer privately financed production of useful goods, she will do so under the heaviest taxes in her history and under a national bonded debt 10 times heavier than at any

time before the war. Her debt is now about \$150,000,000,000. It will be increased this year by a deficit of about \$68,000,000,000. This makes \$218,000,000,000. It will reach at least \$300,000,000,000 by the end of the fighting. The interest charge on this debt at 2 percent would be \$6,000,000,000, or about the size of the ordinary civilian budget of the Federal Government.

Yet, if America is to survive, we must carry this burden in our stride. Our War bonds which represent this debt are held by every church, insurance company, bank, trustee, and practically every family in America. We must pay the interest on them. We must pay enough of their maturities to enable us to refund the rest. These bonds are evidence of our national credit. To carry these bonds and pay our current taxes, we must produce a larger national income in real wealth than at any time before the war.

I believe that we can do this, because in this war we have discovered new productive strength within ourselves, and there are available for development new products of tremendous value. Our stability will depend upon our ability to use much of our new productive strength and to market our new products. Our ability to do this will depend in turn upon first-class cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture, and government in a spirit of mutual helpfulness coupled with a desire to develop the resources and the markets of the world. We need both the resources and the markets. It will call for participation by industry, labor, agriculture, and government in preventing the abuses by private interests of their new opportunities for world markets. It will require also a fair return to industry, labor, and agriculture for their initiative and their efforts in producing the wealth which the world needs.

To fail, within the United States, to develop this post-war prosperity through increased production of civilian goods, soon would mean a shortage of food, clothing, shelter, and of other goods in the midst of a world capable of producing more than enough to meet the shortage, provided there be peace, stability, and a reasonable assurance of stability for many years ahead. Such a disaster here, coupled with the taxes that we shall have upon us, would bring about a depression that would make the last one look like comparative prosperity. It would force upon us totalitarian regimentation in fact if not also in name. To permit this to occur through lack of planning, preparation, and cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture, and government would be criminal. For the Senate of the United States to fail to see its share of the responsibility or to fail to take its share of leadership necessary to avoid this calamity and to reestablish prosperity would be inexcusable. The decision should not be delayed. A part of it is involved in the resolution now before the Senate.

To develop this post-war prosperity in America we must have peace, stability, reasonable assurance of stability, and a readiness to develop new discoveries and new opportunities. I speak in terms of

aviation, radio, electric power, Diesel power, automotive power, possibly atomic power, electric welding, light metals, improved housing, refrigeration and cooling devices, chemistry, chemurgy, plastics, wood, fiber glass, soybeans, sulfa drugs, and countless other "acres of diamonds" available close at hand.

Using aviation as a specific example, we find that 3 years ago America produced \$280,000,000 worth of airplanes; 2 years ago \$1,800,000,000; 1 year ago \$6,400,000,000. This year it will be over \$20,000,000,000; efforts are being made to raise it to thirty or forty billion dollars next year. By way of comparison our automobile industry at its peak produced only \$4,000,000,000 worth of automobiles a year. I cite this not because I expect or want us to continue to produce four-engine bomber planes at this rate in time of peace. I cite this because for a short time following the day of military victory, we shall have available a capacity in plants, tools, skilled workmen, skilled supervisors, pilots, ground crews, and airports sufficient to revolutionize the transportation and communication systems of civilization. It has been estimated that if we prepare carefully we may be able to turn to private production and industry 10 percent of this capacity. The opportunity is so extraordinary and the investment so great that it deserves our every attention to do this much or more.

Aviation can provide savings in time and in money of infinite value to us and to all the world. It can open new resources and new markets of equally immeasurable worth. It should be noted, however, that its greatest value lies in its longest trips. Its full value may well depend upon its world-wide success. This world-wide scope is characteristic of many of the opportunities of tomorrow when all the world will have become a neighborhood. I will emphasize later a further vital relation that military aviation may have, both to our internal stability and to world-wide stability.

The radio is another example of a new industry of limitless value. Its greatest success likewise may depend in large part upon its world-wide operations.

The automotive industry brings to mind the tremendous recent developments in the use of light metals, in the efficiency of gasoline engines, and in the quality of gasoline. Post-war civilian automobiles may travel 50 miles on a gallon of gasoline. This means tremendous new value in the automobile of tomorrow. The potential market will be world-wide.

Henry Ford has estimated that in his opinion great advances can be made in reducing the cost of agricultural production. He has pointed out that in industry when the cost of labor increased this was absorbed by improving mechanical equipment and general methods of production. The increased cost of labor has not been absorbed as well in agriculture. Henry Ford has estimated, however, that through the improved efficiency of agricultural mechanical equipment, the reduction in the weight and cost of that equipment and the reduction in the cost and need for repairs of that equipment, to say nothing of extended and improved use of fertilizers and the

development of farmer cooperatives, the cost of agricultural production can be reduced by about 50 percent. If this estimate is good for even half that much, it will amount to a saving of 25 percent in the cost of production. This would be a tremendous gain to America and to the world.

For all this to take place, however, there must be a successful reconversion from wartime governmentally financed industry to peacetime privately financed industry.

This calls for the practical consideration of many steps to be taken in connection with the termination of war contracts, the provision of financial reserves in the face of renegotiation and taxation, the establishment and maintenance of labor relations which shall be fair to labor, industry, and consumer alike, and shall increase rather than reduce the total value and volume of industrial production.

In the field of internal stability within the United States, therefore, there must be post-war planning taking place now if this stability is to be secured. While it is true that the problems of the internal post-war stability have many international aspects, they have also many purely internal aspects. As to the internal aspects, post-war planning and preparation should now be under way if we are to meet them successfully. In this field we know the problems, we know the men concerned, and we have the primary responsibility for successful action. The responsibility rests upon industry, labor, agriculture, and the Government of the United States. The process can be aided by governmental leadership. The Senate has taken commendable action in providing a post-war planning committee under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. There is no need for specific reference to this internal planning program in the pending resolution relating to foreign policy. Even in post-war planning and governmental effort in the local field of internal stability, we have many incidental indications of a related need for post-war planning in the larger and more difficult field of international affairs. For example, to be concrete, the close relationship between international problems and the problem of internal stability is apparent in such an industry as aviation. Aviation, in its natural course, will reach into countless international issues, and must receive consideration in planning our foreign policy and our own internal development as producers in that field, or as users of that service will call for peace, stability, and the assurance of stability for many years to come.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. In speaking earlier about the need of internal stability in the United States, the Senator developed the fact that at the end of the war we shall probably have a debt of at least \$300,000,000,000, the interest charges alone on which will be \$6,000,000,000, plus normal Government expenditures of—if

they stay that low—\$12,000,000,000. The Senator pointed out that we simply must keep our economy running in high gear in order to carry such a load. He has pointed out some connections between the problem of internal stability by reconversion of America to peacetime production and our international picture.

I think there is one other connection, and that is, that if we do not have a real effective system of collective security in the world the United States will have to depend for security solely on its own armed strength. Then, in addition to the load of \$12,000,000,000 or \$15,000,000,000 of taxes, we shall have to add, for an indefinite period of time, for military expenditures, \$10,000,000,000, \$15,000,000,000, or \$20,000,000,000 a year. I doubt if we could build an economy which could carry that much of a tax load without a reduction in the standards of living of every family in America.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I think a vital factor in America's ability to recover will be that we shall not have the burden of extreme military expenditures which would probably keep us on a basis of financial deficit.

REGIONAL STABILITY—WITHIN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Regional stability in the Western Hemisphere is likewise of extreme importance to us. Our responsibility for planning and preparing for post-war stability in this hemisphere is closely comparable to our responsibility for planning and preparing for it within the United States. In the Western Hemisphere all the nations are at peace with each other, and most of them are allies in the fight against totalitarian slavery.

Improved transportation and new industrial production will increase prosperity throughout North, Central, and South America in a way that will benefit the entire Western Hemisphere, including ourselves, if we can but have peace, stability, and reasonable assurance of stability for many years ahead. Under such conditions private industry within this new, great neighborhood of the Americas will prosper "like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season." Within this hemisphere, as well as within the United States, the primary responsibility for planning and for leadership again rests with the people and Government of the United States because of our dominating position in the hemisphere. Again, we know the people; we know the problems. Europe will not look after this for us, and we do not wish Europe to do so. It is traditionally a part of the Monroe Doctrine that the Americas shall look after themselves so far as possible.

In the future era of a global neighborhood, the Western Hemisphere will find itself more closely related than ever before to the markets, the resources, and the competition of the rest of the world. This increases rather than lessens the necessity for post-war planning within the Western Hemisphere. This again calls for cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture, and government.

We have in the Pan American Union an agency for hemispheric cooperation which is helpful in meeting our needs. It provides a natural method for decentralizing a portion of the international problems of the world so as to relieve the world of those problems which have a peculiarly hemispheric character. Here, again, however, we have an example of the need for post-war planning, and there is room for greater progress along the line. International aviation in the Western Hemisphere is a good example of where it is needed now. In the foreign-policy resolution relating to world-wide stability there is no need for referring especially to these hemispheric problems. It is important, however, to make sure that in whatever declarations of post-war foreign policy we may make, opportunity shall be preserved for the nations of the Western Hemisphere to proceed to handle their regional problems in the future much as they have done in the past.

WORLD-WIDE STABILITY

This brings us to the greater and more difficult problem of world-wide stability. Here the issues are of many kinds. Here also post-war planning by the United States, and in particular by the United States Senate, is appropriate and necessary. It is equally important, however, to recognize that there are several different types of issues to be considered. On some of them more action can and should be taken now than on others. It is quite as important not to do now the things that should not be done now as it is to do now the things that should be done now. Questions of world-wide stability are different from those of internal or even regional stability in that they immediately involve other nations besides ourselves and besides those with which we have a natural association through our location in this hemisphere or through our membership in the Pan American Union. In the field of world-wide stability, unlike the field of internal and regional stability, we do not and cannot know at first hand all the people involved nor all angles of the problems involved. There also are questions concerned with the regional stability of regions outside the Western Hemisphere with which we have as little to do and should have as little to do as the nations of Europe and Asia should have to do with our problems in our hemisphere. Furthermore, in the field of global international problems which do have a world-wide character we necessarily share the general responsibility for the solution of them with the other nations of the world. We cannot and should not dictate these solutions to the world, and the world should not dictate them to us. Whatever decisions are made or procedures adopted, these should be developed through the joint consideration and joint action of all of the nations concerned. Some special leadership may be feasible on the part of certain nations because of their greater size and power. It is fundamental, however, to the philosophy of the United States of America that the smaller and independent nations shall

receive fair treatment. Whatever post-war plans may be developed they should be the result of consideration on the part of all those nations that are affected by them. Accordingly, a preliminary necessity arises in this field for bringing all those nations together for early and preliminary consideration of these plans.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that I believe I have heard everything he has said, and I want to compliment him on presenting a very lucid and at times a very inspirational statement of fact, history and the problem at hand. Just now the Senator's remarks caused me to think along this line: Apparently he is not suggesting any definite plan which he would recommend at this time for a world organization. Is that correct?

Mr. BURTON. I am supporting the amendment presented by the 14 Senators, which includes the recommendation for an international organization to do certain things as there stated. To that extent, I am making such a recommendation, and I believe that is one of the two vitally important minimum provisions which should be included in the statement of policy by the Senate at this time.

Mr. WILEY. From the remarks the Senator made a few moments ago, apparently he feels that if there were an over-all authority there might be also regional authorities, because, as in the Western Hemisphere there are specific problems which should be handled by the nations of the Western Hemisphere without interference from the East or the West, likewise there is a similar situation as affecting Europe. I take that to be his idea, following Mr. Churchill's thought of a concert of nations.

Mr. BURTON. I do not know about Mr. Churchill's thought because I am not prepared to identify it as such; but I am prepared to say that there has been a natural trend, particularly strong during the last 20 years, since the last war, and up to this time, of the decentralization of some international problems, based upon improved activity and greater transportation and communication facilities, which, in a natural way, may very well lead to a partial solution of the great difficulty of attempting to handle the entire world through one organization. In that there lies great hope, and there certainly could be nothing to conflict with that natural trend in any resolution we might adopt at this time which would enable the solution to adapt itself, as I am trying to argue, to conditions of the times, which may be somewhat different from what they have been at other times. That may very well be. Certainly the Pan American Union will continue to exercise its functions. Probably in Central Europe there might arise at some time a different type of problems, but with regionalized authority and an over-all organization there may be a substantial guaranty of peace for years to come.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BURTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator, of course, recalls that one of the problems of the League of Nations was that a number of South American republics were members of the League, and when what might be called isolated European problems were presented they had a vote on them. Probably from that experience we have learned that it would be feasible, providing all the occupants could be induced to come into the house, to segregate, so to speak, even the apartment house into various regions, so that those of the Western Hemisphere could take care of their own problems, if they were Western Hemisphere problems, and so forth. There is one thing that bothers me, and I should like to have it made clear in my own mind, if the Senator will yield further—

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I assume that the purpose of this debate is, primarily, not to provide any definite plan but to indicate to ourselves and to the world that America is willing—"Barkis is willin'," in other words—to cooperate with right-minded nations to try to find a solution to the problem of war. Is not that primarily the purpose of this debate?

Mr. BURTON. I think probably that is the purpose of the resolution as reported by the committee, but I believe that, in order to make that purpose really valuable to the President, to the people, and to our allies and ourselves, there are two propositions which should be more clearly expressed than they are expressed in the resolution, and, therefore, I am supporting the amendment to it.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will yield further, assume, then, that that is the purpose, it must be clear to everyone that before that purpose can be effectuated the contracting parties, whether the United Nations or others, will get together around the table and there develop a plan which ultimately will be put into effect and which we hope will make the future peace of the world secure. Is not that correct?

Mr. BURTON. Yes. I am trying to emphasize the fact that when we enter into the world-wide field of international relations others have just as much to say about it from their point of view as we have to say from our point of view, and we are, therefore, in our approach trying to express the principle that we should not dictate to them and they should not dictate to us; and the solution which may come out of it may be as different from the one we took into it as the solution which came out of the Constitutional Convention differed from that which any man took into that Convention.

Mr. WILEY. About half an hour ago the Senator brought out the idea that we were building a house; he brought out the idea that there would have to be a foundation, a superstructure, and so forth. Would it not be a little more clear to say that instead of building the house we are taking the first step to assemble the architects and lay the plans

so that the apartment house may be built?

Mr. BURTON. We certainly are not in the blueprint stage; we are way behind that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe we must keep in mind, if I may respectfully so suggest, that we are telling the architect something; we are saying something to the man who is going to negotiate the treaty, and when the treaty comes back to the Senate for consideration it has to bear some reasonable identity to that which we are telling him now; and unless that which we are telling him now is clear enough so that he can recognize an identity and be bound by something that is done here, that which we are doing is an entirely futile thing.

Mr. BURTON. I agree with what the Senator from Colorado says. It is entirely an expression of difference of degree as to how far there is wisdom in what we do at this time. I shall be concrete as I move on to the provisions which I am advocating.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. As a young lad I spent a good many years in the Southwestern States, where tortillas and cyclones were prevalent. The safety of human life depended upon the building, and nearly always the first thing the early settlers built for their own safety and security was not the house, the mansion, with the exposures east or west, or a plan as to who was to occupy the master bedroom, but they built first a storm cellar. My idea is we are trying to construct first of all a storm cellar for the safety and security of the people of this Nation.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

EMERGENCY WORLD-WIDE PROBLEMS

Turning now to the emergency world-wide problems as a classification of a type of world war problems that are before us, I think it is important for us to classify the type of problems we face, because the treatment of all of them cannot be identical.

There are, first of all, the emergency problems requiring immediate attention, and then there are those involving long-term considerations, and not calling for immediate treatment. The emergency world-wide civilian problems require immediate international planning, preparation, and action on the part of the United Nations just as much as do the battles of the war itself. The issues involved present themselves on as short notice as do military emergencies. They require prompt treatment. Prompt planning and preparation for them is therefore as important as the planning and preparation for any battle. Some of this already is under way. Among the problems are those of demobilization, the administration of occupied territories, and the provision for foreign relief and rehabilitation.

These world-wide civilian problems are of such an urgent nature that they are good examples of the fact that some post-war issues involving world-wide stability inescapably require immediate action long before the coming of the peace.

In the field of demobilization, it is important that there be an understanding among the United Nations. If and when some portions of the war shall end before others, there will be a natural desire on the part of many to return to private industry as rapidly as possible. On the other hand, it is of common importance to the world, including ourselves, that the remainder of the fighting continue with the greatest possible vigor until complete victory is won in both hemispheres. There should, therefore, be international understandings reached on the subject of demobilization even though those understandings need not rise to the formality of treaties. It should be recognized that we and the other nations have a common interest not only in fighting the war to successful determination in both hemispheres but also in the return as soon as possible of every nation to a productive and self-sustaining basis. In our own country, as well as in others, there will be a natural desire to reestablish peacetime industries, and there will be important international considerations involved in determining the extent to which each nation should be free to proceed with its own demobilization policy.

Similarly, in the administration of occupied territories, whether they be the pre-war territories of our allies or of our enemies, it is essential that there be a well-coordinated international program for administering these territories. This becomes exceedingly important when enemy territory is occupied. Executive consideration has been given to this issue among the United Nations, and it is important that mature international policies be developed in the clearest manner possible.

The administration of foreign relief and rehabilitation is another example of the emergency post-war program which must be met. Preliminary steps are under way at the invitation of the United States Government for the consideration of the general issues involved. In the meantime, temporary international agreements are being worked out on an emergency basis.

The action of the United States in this regard, in the first instance, was sought to be made a purely executive action. This would have been extremely unfortunate in view of the important part which congressional appropriations necessarily will have in this problem. A program now has been developed whereby appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress are familiar with the contemplated procedure and are in touch with the development of the program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator speaks about temporary international arrangements or agreements. I have not the Constitution before me, but I know it provides that all treaties and agreements with foreign nations shall be made by the President and concurred in by the Senate of the United States by a two-thirds majority. Where does the Senator find provision for the making of temporary agreements without compliance with the provision of the Constitution as to ratification? I do not understand how that can be done under our Constitution. The Constitution was made for both war and peace, and it seems to me that we should adhere to it. We are sworn on our oaths to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. I have had that oath administered to me eight times during my service in the House and in the Senate, and that oath is supposed to be a very essential matter. In my judgment it is the most essential oath I ever took in my life, and I do not feel like preparing or planning for temporary agreements to be made by someone in the United States other than in accordance with the constitutional provision.

I read from page 402 of the Senate Manual, which is in the possession of every Senator, a part of section 2 of article 2 of the Constitution:

The President * * * shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

That language is clear and unmistakable, and under our oaths of office we are bound to adhere to that provision.

The Senator has spoken of temporary agreements. I notice in the press that Mr. Landis had been sent to Egypt to grant bounties and subsidies and relief in that part of the world, and that Mr. Baldwin had been sent to some other place, Sicily, I believe, to grant relief to the people in that part of the world. In view of the constitutional provision, I am wondering how relief can be granted in the methods the Senator from Ohio is suggesting. I do not think we have any authority to do it except by agreements entered into by the constitutional method.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Tennessee will find no more ardent advocate of observance of the constitutional provision as to treaties than the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure of that. It is because I have great confidence in the Senator from Ohio that I am asking him this question. He is an able Senator and a fine man, and I should like to have him answer my question.

Mr. BURTON. I can give the Senator my understanding of the matter, and there are present representatives of the Committee on Foreign Relations who, I am sure, can expand my answer further for the Senator's benefit.

As I understand, a treaty, of course, must be handled precisely as the Senator has stated, and I state that in my opinion an instrument which rises to the dignity of the one referred to in the discussion we are carrying on, which involves peace

among all the nations, to endure from now on, through an organization or otherwise, would certainly rise to the point of the greatest dignity among international agreements, and should be a treaty, and should come under the provision which requires ratification by a vote of two-thirds of the Senate. However, I understand that there are many agreements which are not treaties, for example, agreements often of short duration. For instance, there was the recent action of the Senate and the House together in authorizing reciprocal trade agreements. Those are not subject to ratification by two-thirds of the Senate, but by authorization of a majority of the House and the Senate an agreement may be entered into, and then the agreement, not a treaty, is carried out under the provisions of the act of Congress.

Furthermore, I have understood that in some instances there has been action by both Houses in cases which have been on the border line, such cases where it has been rather difficult to determine whether the matter in question happened to be a treaty or was not a treaty.

As I understand, there was some controversy when the State of Texas was admitted to the Union as to whether it should come in by treaty or by agreement. I believe it came in by agreement. Am I correct, I ask the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]?

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Constitution provides that a new State may be admitted to the Union by Congress. A State cannot be admitted except by action of both Houses. In the case of the admission of Texas into the Union, a treaty was made which was rejected by the Senate. Texas was admitted as a new State by passage by Congress of a joint resolution. The only way it could have been admitted was by the passage of a joint resolution, because the Constitution specifically states that a new State shall be admitted by Congress, meaning both Houses of Congress.

Mr. BURTON. Also, as I understand, the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, conducts a great many negotiations in his military capacity, and, particularly in the present war, has entered into a great many military agreements which have been regarded as Executive agreements. A question arose, as I understand, with respect to the relief and rehabilitation subject, a matter which is on the border line, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] called it to the attention of the Secretary of State in time to prevent its being handled merely as an Executive agreement. I understand the matter has been worked out now so that it is not to be in the form of a formal treaty, but that it will come before the two Houses of Congress in some other form before it finally becomes effective. I ask the Senator from Michigan if I am correct in that statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If it is of any interest in respect to the present discussion I shall be glad very briefly to reply to the very able Senator's question.

The inquiry raised by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] of course is an imponderable one: When does an international obligation cease to rise to the dignity of a treaty? When does it, in lesser degree, cease to require joint action of the two Houses of Congress, or when can it be a power exercised solely by the Executive?

In the relief and rehabilitation agreement to which the able Senator from Ohio refers, I think we probably have as good an example of the entire gamut as we have had under any other circumstances. In this instance the Executive and the State Department at first announced that the relief and rehabilitation draft agreement would be executed by Executive agreement. It was to be done exclusively by the administrative arm of the Government, without reference to Congress.

As the Senator from Ohio indicates, I challenged that interpretation of the situation by a resolution which requested the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to inquire into the question whether or not the relief and rehabilitation draft rose to the dignity of a treaty. The committee immediately considered the matter, and subsequently appointed a subcommittee on the subject. I think it was very clearly the opinion of the committee that as originally drawn the relief and rehabilitation draft agreement did involve practically illimitable obligations on the United States almost in perpetuity, and that as drawn it was a treaty, or should have been. Certainly it was not an obligation such as could be concluded merely by Executive agreement.

Thereupon a special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and two Under Secretaries of the Department of State undertook to rewrite the draft agreement so as to eliminate from it those illimitable commitments which carried it into the realm of a treaty, and which brought it back into what we thought was the realm of an agreement. We succeeded in rewriting it to a point where it is now literally nothing more than the authorization of appropriation, and there is no commitment in the text to anything except the expenditure of such moneys as are specifically appropriated from time to time by Congress for this purpose. Furthermore, the agreement itself will be textually included within the measure providing for the authorization of the appropriations.

If I may finish, I will say that that is as good an example as I know of to illustrate the question which the Senator raises. I was convinced in the first instance that the relief and rehabilitation agreement should have been a treaty. The President was convinced that he could proceed by Executive agreement. There we have the two extremes of the possibilities. We have rewritten the text so that, in my opinion and in the opinion of the State Department, we can now proceed on the basis of joint action by the two Houses, by action which is less than treaty action, because the text itself has become merely the authorization of an appropriation.

Therefore it seems to me that the question raised by the Senator from Tennessee is one which can be answered only in respect to the text of the particular agreement or treaty or Executive order which is under discussion.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Burton. I yield.

Mr. McKellar. What has become of the measure to which the Senator referred? Has it been passed by both Houses?

Mr. Vandenberg. No. The unofficial agreement to proceed in this fashion was made in the Foreign Relations Committee perhaps 3 or 4 weeks ago, without any action of the committee, simply in a general conference. It was the understanding that it would take about 6 weeks to complete the agreement. It is my understanding that at the end of 6 weeks the relief and rehabilitation agreement embodied in an authorization for appropriation will be submitted to both Houses of Congress, so that both Houses will pass not only on the authorization but also on the text of the agreement.

Mr. Austin. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. Burton. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. Austin. This very question has arisen many times, and it has always seemed to me to involve a question of fact, that is to say whether there is a distinction between an agreement and a treaty. If there is a distinction, and the distinction is recognized in the Constitution of the United States, then the atmosphere seems to be cleared, because then the provisions referred to by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee apply to one thing, which is a treaty, and do not apply to the other thing, which is an agreement.

I interpose at this point in order to point out the place in the Constitution where the difference between a treaty and a contract is recognized. Section 10 of article I of the Constitution provides:

No State shall enter into any treaty—

I do not need to read the remainder of the section. What I have read is good for the purpose of showing that the Constitution is dealing with the subject under consideration—a treaty. In subsection 3 we find this language:

No State shall, without the consent of Congress—

I am omitting some of the provision—enter into any agreement or compact—

I omit some more language—
with a foreign power.

I do not conclude the reading of the sentence. It is not necessary to do so. I have read into the Record sufficient to show that the founding fathers recognized the distinction between a treaty and a compact, and that they made an absolute prohibition against a State entering into a treaty, but that they made only a conditional prohibition to a State entering into a compact or agreement,

and to this day, if a State can secure from the Congress permission to do so, it may enter into an agreement or compact with a foreign country.

Mr. Burton. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. Pepper. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. Burton. I yield.

Mr. Pepper. The able Senator from Tennessee has, of course, properly pointed out the provision of the Constitution which requires the ratification, by two-thirds majority of the Senate, of any instrument which, as the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. Austin] has pointed out, has the characteristics of a treaty and not an agreement.

Assuming that is the necessary constitutional power of the Senate, then may not the Senate properly consider whether there is any proper way to avoid complete absence of any assurance on the part of the Senate as to what it will do, or whether such assurance can be given before the actual occurrence of the event at some indefinite time in the future, after the treaty has run the gamut of the rules of the Senate with respect to consideration and debate?

In other words, without anyone's having any idea of questioning or circumventing the constitutional right of the Senate to pass upon a proposed treaty before it becomes a treaty, may not the Senate recognize what the significance of the complete exercise of that power, without anything more, is to the country and to the world? May it not take into consideration the kind of world organization we are now contemplating, to which 20, 30, 40, or 50 states might be signatory powers, and the consequence if we wait until the war is over and the conference is held, and until 20, 30, 40, or 50 powers have agreed to an instrument, before we ever indicate in any way fairly and clearly our policy, and if we say we will keep the world and our President in complete ignorance until the document comes back to us and until we debate it and finally vote upon it one way or the other by a two-thirds vote? Is not the very existence of that constitutional power of the Senate enough, under the present circumstances of the world, to make the Senate try to find some way to give other advice and direction which will tend to minimize the possible danger of a method which failed us in respect to the League of Nations?

Mr. Burton. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida, and I assume that the reason why he is advocating the action we are taking now is in order to meet the needs of that situation, and I believe such procedure is constructive.

Mr. Wiley. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Burton. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. Wiley. I heard the Senator make a statement a few moments ago which I am sure I correctly understood. It was to the effect that in his opinion the adoption of either the pending resolution or the resolution as proposed to be amended would in no wise empower the President to make any agreement or

treaty, whatever it might be, which would not be required to be sent back to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. BURTON. That is my position; that either under the resolution of the committee or under the resolution as proposed to be amended, the document would come back to the Senate. I propose to state that specifically later on, and also to express my entire willingness to emphasize that point, as suggested by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and to write in a separate paragraph to that effect if the Senator wishes to have that done.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. That had always been my view; but when I read in the RECORD the colloquy which occurred yesterday between the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I found that there seems to be a precedent on the basis of which, were the Senate to agree to a resolution similar to one now pending, it would be possible for it to be said that under it we were consenting, let us say, to an alliance between Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, and then it could be proclaimed, because the resolution would be broad enough to include that.

Mr. BURTON. I am frank to say to the Senator that I can recognize the possibility of a legal argument that our action was so specific and concrete that someone might interpret it as advice and consent before the document was before us, that it so clearly describes the document that it might just as well have been before us.

I can see nothing in the amendment which is before the Senate which would approach that, but I would not have the slightest objection to incorporating in the amendment the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, so it would be plain, and so there could be no argument on that score.

Mr. WHEELER. In view of the precedent which has been called to the attention of the Senate and the citation by Mr. Hackworth, who was the counsel for the State Department for a great number of years, certainly something of that kind ought to be put in the resolution.

Mr. BURTON. In referring for a further moment to the matter of relief and rehabilitation, let me say that I believe this question is an example of an emergency issue of great importance, both to the rest of the world and to the United States. Not only does it involve important international relations affecting the conduct of the war and the condition of the people in occupied territories, but it involves serious financial questions for all nations contributing to, as well as for those benefiting from, its large expenditures.

It is natural and appropriate that the United States will wish to help the people of the occupied territories in meeting their emergency needs for food, clothing, and shelter. It is equally clear that neither the United States nor the Allies

will be able to meet these needs fully or for an extended period. There is a serious limitation upon our capacity to supply these needs for foreign relief and rehabilitation in addition to supplying the needs of our own military and civilian population together with the needs of our allies represented in the lend-lease program. Any exaggeration of the extent to which the United States and others may supply the desired relief and rehabilitation of occupied territories is bound to lead to disappointment and to bitterness where precisely the opposite result should be the case. Therefore, in this field in particular, there attaches great importance to early post-war planning and to preparation among the United Nations, including the United States of America, to determine just what the procedures, the contributions, and the limitations to the relief and rehabilitation program shall be.

In these three fields of emergency international policy it has been essential for many weeks that international action be taken. In my opinion it would have been helpful if the Senate of the United States had expressed itself to some extent upon these issues, and had taken a more active personal part in the planning of the action, or if it had been given that opportunity, at least to a greater degree than was the case, by the Executive. The need for continued planning exists, and it should be a part of any program of post-war activity, whether or not it becomes a part of the general peace negotiations, of the long-term post-war program, or is included expressly in any declaration of senatorial policy on the subject.

WORLD-WIDE MILITARY STABILITY

We now come to what I regard as practically a critical consideration, a major consideration, in the world-wide stability program: World-wide military stability.

The long-term problems of world-wide stability are divisible into those involving military, economic, social, and political stability. Of these, the questions of military stability are separable from the rest. They present an important aspect which bears not only upon the long-term stability of the world but also upon immediate post-war stability and upon the conduct of the war itself.

Of all the factors in the whole post-war field the one that is more clear than all others is that on the day when the fighting is over and the war won and the armistice comes, there will then be, for a moment at least, military stability in the area of the world covered by that victory and that armistice. From this it also follows that if the United Nations, which will have constituted the United Nations military championship team which will have won that victory, shall remain united, that fact will carry with it the best possible assurance of the continuity of the military stability of that moment. On the other hand, to the extent that the United Nations shall cease to be united in peace as they were in war, there inevitably will be introduced an element of uncertainty as to the military stability of the world. Such disintegration of unity among the United Nations

would not, thank God, necessarily mean war among them. It would, however, necessarily mean the creation of uncertainty among them as to the military prospects of the future. This would make it necessary for each nation to offset that uncertainty to the best of its ability.

As long as the Axis Powers were able to attack the free nations of the world separately, the Axis Powers were successful. One by one the Axis occupied the territory of the free nations; one by one the Axis took from those nations their freedom to exercise their cherished sovereignty; one by one, in varying degrees, the Axis reduced the population of those territories to slavery. On the other hand, when the United Nations finally united their strength, their combined resistance became successful. It is upon that continued unity of effort that the United Nations rely for their victory in the war. From a purely military standpoint, therefore, even apart from all other considerations, it would seem clear that the primary policy of military stability in each of the United Nations should be to insure their military unity of action in time of peace as well as in time of war. The planning for this and the need of this is so great that it should be given primary consideration in any discussion of world-wide post-war stability.

It is important that this unity extend to all of the United Nations and not merely to some of them. To the extent that any are omitted, an element of military uncertainty immediately is introduced which not only is unnecessary but which compels those separated from the rest to provide, as best they can, for their military security apart from the United Nations. This is the natural first step away from peace and toward World War No. 3. In the case of large powers, this would mean continued and large expenditures for military purposes substantially in excess of what otherwise would be necessary. In the case of the smaller or weaker powers it would mean a search by them for strong allies. Those, in turn, would seek further alliances or provide larger armaments for their protection and the protection of those joining with them.

Such a course of generally increasing armaments would also have a bad effect in our case, for example, upon our chances for internal industrial recovery and stability. As has just been brought out by the questions of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the need for retaining or increasing our military strength as a result of the lack of military unity among the United Nations would place an increased burden of public expense upon us at precisely the time when our greatest need would be for a decrease rather than an increase in governmental expenditures of every kind. Such a need might force us to a continued program of deficiency financing at the very time when our internal stability called, above all things, for a balanced Budget. It might destroy our best chance of recovery.

From the point of view of internal recovery, as well as of military policy, it

thus becomes a primary consideration that the United States Senate include in its post-war foreign policy, without fail and without ambiguity, the unity of the United Nations in peace as well as in war.

The importance of this principle should not be confused or clouded by premature discussions of the details of post-war military organization or by the use of such a widely misunderstood term as that of an "international police force."

The need which exists does not turn upon the provision of an international police force in the sense associated with the policing of cities and other local communities. The suggestion of the need for an international gestapo is completely without foundation. The need for defining the form of the military force which may be available in connection with the continued unity of the United Nations in peace as well as in war is inappropriate and unnecessary. The only essential consideration is one that hardly requires explanation. It is that on the day of victory the United Nations will be exercising a unity of military strength which will make it unnecessary for them to arm against each other, and which will provide the greatest protection in the history of the world against successful military aggression or violation of the peace of the world.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the hour is growing late. It will be necessary to have an executive session. I rise to propose a unanimous consent agreement. I know that the Senator from Ohio has not concluded his remarks, and will not be able to do so for approximately an hour. I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at 12 o'clock the Senator from Ohio be recognized, and that he may proceed with his remarks at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no intention of objecting, if the Senator is weary.

Mr. BURTON. I am perfectly willing to proceed, if the Senator prefers to have me do so, but I shall have a substantial amount left for tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in connection with this request, let me say that it is highly important that this resolution be passed at the earliest practicable moment. Mr. Hull is now at Moscow, in conference with the representatives of other great nations associated with us in this war, and which presumably will be associated with us in any post-war peace arrangement which may be made. The longer this debate is dragged along, the more likely it is that there will be created in the minds of those at Moscow and elsewhere abroad the impression that there is a real, substantial division of sentiment in the United States Senate and throughout the country as to whether we shall adopt a post-war resolution. For that reason I wish to serve notice now, not with any idea of inconveniencing Senators, but with the idea of conserving time, that I shall undertake to insist that the debate

proceed until 5 o'clock each afternoon, unless there are some mitigating circumstances.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in view of the remarks of the Senator, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator need not withdraw his request.

Mr. HATCH. I notice that it is now 10 minutes before 5. I thought we could go ahead until 5 o'clock.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not yield any further. I am making this suggestion for the future. I am trying to be amenable and agreeable. What I have said is of the utmost importance. While that conference is under way, we are here wrangling over whether an "an" should be inserted somewhere in the resolution, and whether "organization" and "authority" are of equal dignity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow the Senator from Ohio have the floor and proceed with his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. What is the request?

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] be permitted to resume the floor tomorrow upon the convening of the Senate, and proceed with his address.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator's request include any limitation on how long the Senator from Ohio shall speak?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. Only time will tell that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. ELSTON of Ohio, and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Navy and the Marine

Corps, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Haggerty to be comptroller, Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Barc to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jack R. Caufield to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE— JAMES W. JOHNSON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James W. Johnson to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I do not wish to keep the Senate in session unnecessarily, but in connection with the nomination of Mr. James W. Johnson, which has just been confirmed, I should like to have a short statement which I have prepared printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WAGNER's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege to endorse and support the nomination of James W. Johnson as collector of internal revenue for the third New York collection district, in place of Joseph T. Higgins, who recently resigned to become a candidate for the city court bench.

Mr. Johnson has had a long and distinguished career in the service of his community, State, and country. After graduation in 1917 from the academy of Howard University in Washington, D. C., he entered the College of the City of New York. Shortly thereafter he enlisted in the Army and saw active combat service overseas with the Field Artillery.

On returning to civilian life, he received his Bachelor of Laws degree from New York University in 1926. He engaged in the practice of law, and served as attorney for the H. O. L. C. and as special counsel for the Paul Lawrence Dunbar Apartments and the Dunbar National Bank.

He was appointed chief, office deputy collector of the third New York collection district on April 21, 1939, later was promoted to the position of assistant to the collector with supervision over the office and field divisions.

He completed specialized courses in taxation and received the degree of Master of Laws from the School of Law of New York University, in June 1940. Since the resignation of Collector Higgins, Mr. Johnson has served as acting collector.

In addition to this background of experience and legal scholarship, Mr. Johnson has been active in community affairs and national defense.

He served as regimental adjutant of the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry, New York National Guard, converted and redesignated Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Coast Artillery (AA), from November 1933 to December 1940, under four commanding officers. He holds the New York State Long and Faithful Service decoration for 10 years' service in the New York National Guard. He is a graduate of the National Guard and Reserve Officers Course, 1937, of the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga. Since the onset of World War No. 2, he has served as deputy warden and military aide of the thirty-second precinct of the New York City Civilian Defense Service. During 1942, with the assistance of volunteer instructors from the Fifteenth Regiment, New York Guard, he conducted an intensive course of basic military drill instruction for the air raid wardens of the thirty-second precinct.

Mr. Johnson is married and has been a resident of New York City since 1911. He is a former national president of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity and among his affiliations are the American Legion, Veterans' Corps, Fifteenth Regiment, Harlem Lawyers Association, National Bar Association, Beaver Ramapo Democratic Club, Delta Sigma Kappa Fraternity, and the Revelle Club of New York.

The appointment of Mr. Johnson to head the second largest collection district in the country is a splendid and deserving recognition of the merit principle in advancement in Government administration. It reflects also, in these world-shaking times, the ever-increasing recognition of equality of opportunity in our national life, for all men and women of ability, regardless of race or color.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas M. Carey to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate

took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 27 (legislative day of October 26), 1943:

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Lawrence B. Richardson, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, to rank from the 15th day of November 1943.

Capt. Timothy J. Keleher to be a rear admiral in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of June 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Stanley S. Nicolay, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the 10th day of April 1941.

Frederick W. Riggs, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

John W. Southworth, a citizen of Oregon.
John F. Paul, a citizen of Iowa.
Ernest T. Savignano, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Hugh W. Breakenridge, a citizen of Iowa.
Robert "E" McDowell, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 27 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John J. Haggerty to be comptroller, Post Office Department.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John J. Barc to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan.

Jack R. Caufield to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

James W. Johnson to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of New York.

Thomas M. Carey to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Vernon F. Jones, Thawville.

OHIO

Ella M. Manson, Apple Creek.

Edgar K. Brown, Arcanum.

Jesse H. O'Roark, Covington.

Fred L. Diffenderfer, Greentown.

Howard J. Swearingen, Kensington.

O. Pauline Myers, Long Bottom.

Mary Doman, Lyndhurst.

Joann E. Johnston, Macedonia.

Frank W. White, Milford.

Mary C. Melody, New Paris.

Emma Duff, South Solon.

Robert S. McKelvey, Toronto.

Ellinor E. Arick, Valley City.

UTAH

Edna F. Nicholls, Farmington.

Reuben J. Peterson, Santaquin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Roland Q. Leavell, pastor, First Baptist Church, Tampa, Fla., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in days past, our hope in years to come, our refuge from the stormy blasts, and our eternal home, Thou Lord God of all the earth, the Mighty Eternal Creator, the One in whom we live and move and have our being, we turn to Thee this day with gratitude in our hearts for Thy blessings and with petitions upon our lips for Thy gracious presence and providential power to rest upon us. We beseech Thee, Heavenly Father, for wisdom and guidance, and Thy love to be imparted to the Congress of the United States today, and to all of those who are in authority. Help us each to remember that when the righteous are in authority the people rejoice. May this be a glad day as we turn to Thee, and from Thee receive the spirit of sobriety and righteousness and godliness, both in our relationship to Thee and in our attitude and service toward our fellow man. We pray Thy blessing upon the nations of the earth; upon all the peoples who need Thy help. Hasten the day when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, and Thy kingdom shall come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. And until that day help us to be faithful to our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. We ask in His name that is above every name, and for His glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 15, 1943:

H. R. 3291. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

On October 18, 1943:

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson; and

H. R. 2250. An act to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service.

On October 19, 1943:

H. R. 128. An act to authorize a per capita payment of \$10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or

near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

On October 21, 1943:

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin.

On October 23, 1943:

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson; and

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

On October 25, 1943:

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg; and

H. R. 3230. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

On October 26, 1943:

H. R. 2838. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; and

H. R. 3208. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Ford was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

NAVY DAY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and in that time have the Clerk read a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES FLEET,

HEADQUARTERS OF THE

COMMANDER IN CHIEF,

Washington, D. C., October 24, 1943.

The Honorable CARL VINSON,

Member of Congress,

Chairman, Committee

on Naval Affairs,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Navy Day presents an opportunity, of which I am desirous of taking advantage, to send a message to the Members of Congress in appreciation of the hearty cooperation and support which they have given to the Navy since the outset of the war. The fact that the requests of the Navy have been acted upon promptly, unanimously, and without the slightest indication of partisanship, has been not only a source of encouragement to the personnel of the Navy, but has assured us that you have confidence in us and that the legislative branch of the Government is wholeheartedly behind us in our efforts to win the war.

It is a distinct privilege to take this opportunity to express, in the name of my fellow officers and of the enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, our appreciation of your cooperation.

Your unflinching aid and support has been an inspiration, and when the history of this war is written, the record will show that the Navy's achievements have been, in great measure, brought about by the confidence

that the Congress has shown toward the Navy.

The Navy salutes the Members of the Congress as we march on together to what will be a complete victory and, we trust, a speedy one.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. KING,

Admiral, United States Navy; Commander in Chief, United States Fleet; and Chief of Naval Operations.

ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 400) for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this bill is entirely noncontroversial.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is.

Mr. MICHENER. And it has the unanimous support of the committee?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL], a member of the committee, on the minority side.

Mr. HOWELL. It is true this bill has the unanimous support, not only of the subcommittee but of the full committee. That also applies to the amendment which is being offered.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina explain the bill?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will be glad to. The bill is primarily for this purpose: The men in the Public Health Service, who are in the armed forces, are neither fish nor fowl. There are, at the present time, 468 officers with the Coast Guard, from the Public Health; 55 on duty with the Army; and the 24 additional officers are on foreign duty. If those men are killed in action, as they have been, they neither come under the military benefits, though they are serving in the military forces, nor do they come under employees' compensation. Five or 6 of them have been killed, and 6 of them have been captured in the Philippines and are now in prison. I think arrangements have been made to take care of the families of those 6 men now in prison. That is the amendment which was offered to the Senate bill, in order that we might do as required by the Budget during the war; not in emergency, but during this war.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Does that include any of the Red Cross field workers?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The Red Cross field workers do not come under the Public Health.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Are they not in the same position as the Public Health workers?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That may be, but I doubt if our committee would have jurisdiction of them. This is a Public Health Service bill.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, this bill in no way affects Red Cross workers?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No, sir; it does not. I may say further, it does not create any new bureaus or anything like that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. It in no way affects veterans' legislation?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; it does not.

Mr. MICHENER. And it in no way affects the rights of the States?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. How many individuals will this affect?

Mr. BULWINKLE. At the present time there are about 13 officers that it affects. Of course, if some more are killed, they would come under this legislation.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand, this amendment will put these Public Health officers on the same basis as enlisted men or commissioned officers in the Army?

Mr. BULWINKLE. If they are on duty with the armed forces; yes.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand, they are not under the United States Compensation Act at all?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand a great many civilian employees working for contractors, for instance, at Wake Island, were under the United States compensation law and are getting compensation?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the amendment is a very good one.

Mr. MICHENER. It must be a very good bill and amendment when the able Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is generally very careful, very belligerent, and very controversial, comes in with a unanimous report. I am pleased to withdraw my reservation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I just say, Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman withdraws his reservation that the subcommittee had hearings on this subject under H. R. 6409, which is slightly different from S. 400. We decided then to recodify the whole Public Health law. It should be done, but on account of the emergency existing in this situation the subcommittee and the committee deemed it best not to go into that now.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency shall consist of the Office of the Surgeon General, the National Institute of Health, and two bureaus, to be known as the Bureau of Medical Services and the Bureau of State Services. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator, is hereby authorized and directed to assign to the Office of the Surgeon General, to the National Institute of Health, and to the two bureaus, respectively, the several functions of the Public Health Service, and to establish within the

Office of the Surgeon General, the National Institute of Health, and the two bureaus, respectively, such divisions, sections, and other units as may be required to perform their functions; and, under such supervision and direction, he may abolish existing divisions, sections, and other units, and, hereafter, may establish, transfer, and consolidate divisions, sections, and other units and reassign their functions for the efficiency of the Service.

SEC. 2. The Director of the National Institute of Health and the chiefs of each of the bureaus, established by section 1 of this act, and the officer assigned as Chief Medical Officer of the United States Coast Guard, shall be commissioned medical officers detailed by the Surgeon General from the regular corps, and while so detailed shall be Assistant Surgeons General and shall have the same grade and shall receive the same pay and allowances as the Assistant to the Surgeon General.

SEC. 3. When commissioned officers below the grade of medical director are detailed by the Surgeon General from the regular corps to serve as chiefs of divisions, not more than six of such officers at one time while so detailed shall have the temporary grade and receive temporarily the pay and allowances of a medical director; and there is authorized to be established in the Office of the Surgeon General a Dental Division and a Sanitary Engineering Division; the chief of each such Dental and Sanitary Engineering Division shall be a commissioned dental officer and a commissioned sanitary engineer officer, respectively, of the regular corps detailed by the Surgeon General, and while each such dental and sanitary engineer officer is so detailed, he shall have the grade, pay, and allowances of an Assistant Surgeon General as provided by section 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. In time of war or national emergency determined by the President, any commissioned officer of the regular corps of the Public Health Service may be appointed to higher temporary grade with the pay and allowances thereof without vacating his permanent appointment, and any officer so promoted to a higher grade at any time after December 7, 1941, shall be deemed for all purposes to have accepted his promotion to higher grade upon the date of approval, unless he shall expressly decline such promotion, and shall receive the pay and allowances of the higher grade from such date unless he is entitled under some other provision of law to receive the pay and allowances of the higher grade from an earlier date. No such officer who shall have subscribed to the oath of office required by section 1757, Revised Statutes, shall be required to renew such oath or to take a new oath upon his promotion to a higher grade, if his service after the taking of such an oath shall have been continuous. Hereafter reserve officers of the Public Health Service may be distributed in the several grades without regard to the proportion which at any time obtains or has obtained among the commissioned medical officers of such Service. For the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter graduates of reputable osteopathic colleges shall be eligible for appointment as reserve officers in the Public Health Service.

SEC. 5. The record of each commissioned officer of the regular corps initially appointed above the grade of Assistant Surgeon, after the first 3 years of service in such grade, shall be reviewed under regulations approved by the President, and any such officer who is found to be unqualified for further service shall be separated from the Service and paid 6 months' pay and allowances.

SEC. 6. In case of the absence or disability of the Surgeon General and the Assistant to the Surgeon General, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of both, the Assistant

Surgeons General shall act as Surgeon General in the order of their designation for such purpose by the Surgeon General.

SEC. 7. Section 9 of the act of April 9, 1930 (U. S. C. 42, sec. 37; 46 Stat. 151), is hereby amended by the addition of the following language at the end of said section:

"(d) Original appointments in the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve, may be made to a junior grade which shall correspond to that held by a second lieutenant in the Medical Department of the Army and persons so appointed shall be entitled to the same pay and allowances as a second lieutenant in the Medical Department of the Army. After not less than one nor more than 2 years of service each such appointee in the regular corps may be examined under regulations prescribed by the President and upon such examination shall either be promoted to the grade of assistant surgeon or be separated from the Service."

SEC. 8. Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve, shall be entitled to the same pay, allowances, and all other rights, benefits, and privileges, now or hereafter authorized or provided for officers of corresponding grade (and their surviving dependents) of the Medical Corps of the Army, regular and reserve, respectively, including but not limited to burial payments, death benefits, pensions, retirement, insurance, disability and survivors' benefits, civil reemployment rights, civil liability, travel and other allowances, including allowances of military attachés of corresponding grades while serving as public health attachés with the State Department at foreign posts; and all commissioned officers of the Public Health Service detailed for duty with the Army or Navy under provisions of law shall be held and considered to be in the active military service of the United States, and such officers while so detailed shall be subject to all of the laws and regulations now or hereafter operative for the government of the respective services to which they are detailed: *Provided*, That this section shall apply in like manner to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve, and to their surviving dependents, if any, who were serving outside of the continental limits of the United States on December 7, 1941, or who since December 7, 1941, have been made prisoners of war or who have been disabled or who have lost their lives while on active duty, and: *Provided further*, That all commissioned officers of the Public Health Service not detailed for duty with the Army or Navy as above provided shall continue to serve under the direction and control of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service unless specifically detailed for duty with another executive department or independent establishment in accordance with provisions of law.

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "Public Health Service Act of 1943." For the purpose of any reorganization under section 1 of this act the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is hereby authorized to make such transfer of funds between appropriations as may be necessary for the continuance of transferred functions.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, strike out beginning with line 12, down through line 19 on page 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 8. (a) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'full military benefits' means all rights, privileges, immunities, and benefits provided under any law of the United States in the case of commissioned military and naval personnel of the United States (including their surviving beneficiaries) on ac-

count of active military or naval service, including, but not limited to, burial payments in the event of death, six months' pay and allowances in case of death, veterans' compensation and pensions and other veterans' benefits, retirement, including retirement for disability, the rights provided under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, as amended, the National Service Life Insurance Act as amended, travel allowances, including per diem allowances for travel without regard to repeated travel between two or more places in the same vicinity, allowances for uniforms, exemption of certain pay from Federal income taxation, and other benefits, privileges and exemptions under the Internal Revenue laws.

"(2) The term 'limited military benefits' means full military benefits, except veterans' compensation and pensions and other veterans' benefits, and eligibility under the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended.

"(b) Beginning with the date of enactment of this act, commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries)—

"(1) In time of war, shall be entitled to limited military benefits with respect to all active service in the Public Health Service.

"(2) While such officers are detailed for duty with the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to such duty.

"(3) While such officers are serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska in time of war, shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to such service.

"(c) In time of war, the President may by Executive Order declare the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service a part of the military forces of the United States and provide the extent to which it shall be subject to the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy. Upon the issuance of such an Executive Order, all commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries, shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to active service rendered while the Public Health Service is a part of the military forces of the United States.

"SEC. 9. Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries), shall be entitled to receive the same benefits for injury or death in the performance of their duties as civil officers and employees of the United States under the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That any such officer or beneficiary of such officer eligible to receive any benefit authorized by this section who is also eligible to receive any payment or benefit (except the proceeds of any insurance policy) under any provision of law other than such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, on account of the same injury or death, shall elect which benefit he shall receive.

"SEC. 10. The surviving beneficiaries of any commissioned officer of the Public Health Service, regular or reserve, who, since December 7, 1941, and prior to the enactment of this act, has lost his life while on active duty in the Public Health Service or while detailed to the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, shall receive 6 months' pay and allowances as provided in the act of June 4, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., sup. II, title 34, sec. 943), and, unless entitled to compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, shall receive the benefits provided under section 9 of this act."

Page 6, line 20, strike out "9" and insert "11."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An act relating to the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill S. 400 and that these remarks appear in the proceedings in connection with the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. This bill which has just been presented to the House by the unanimous consent of the membership and adopted by a unanimous vote is intended to correct certain inequalities and defects in the existing Public Health Service as well as to adapt other features presently in the law to war purposes. For those reasons, I am in favor of the bill.

On the grounds that the bill may be regarded a war measure, I did not offer any objection to its immediate consideration but I do not approve of all of the provisions of the bill. However, the operation of the bill is limited to a date not later than 6 months after the war.

I direct attention to section 4 of the bill. On line 5, page 4, is found the following language:

For the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter, graduates of reputable osteopathic colleges shall be eligible for appointment as reserve officers in the Public Health Service.

I seriously questioned the wisdom of including osteopaths in this bill because it presumably places the imprimatur of the Congress upon the campaign of the doctors of osteopathy to be recognized as the professional equals of the doctors of medicine. We all know that the requirements for admission to a college of osteopathy and the course of study and training at those colleges do not remotely compare with the entrance requirements and medical training of the average medical school. This provision was not requested by the Public Health Service and as a matter of fact I believe it is unsatisfactory to that Service. The osteopaths were included in this bill in another body without the advice and consent of the Surgeon General.

The dictionary defines osteopathy in these terms:

A system of the art of healing which emphasizes the power of the body to heal itself, and whose therapy majors in manipulation.

I will admit that osteopaths do good work and help patients suffering from those ailments that osteopaths are permitted and eligible to treat. But I cannot and will not admit that most of the ills from which our armed forces suffer requiring treatments, involving serious surgical operations, are usual to the practice of an osteopath. I think it unwise to dignify a person with such limited training and experience with a commission and a rank equal that of a doctor of medicine.

There is no intention on my part to reflect in any way upon the fine character and ability of that vast army of fine men and women who are engaged in the field of osteopathy. I congratulate every citizen, especially those ministering to the sick, for the work he is doing to win the war. At this time, we should not lose sight of the fact that our action here, today, might be asserted as a reason why, in other official circles, a diploma in osteopathy should be given the same weight and rating as a diploma in medicine.

I know it is the view of practically every member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in voting to report this bill to the House, containing legislation which is urgent, that the vote was cast upon the basis of compromise with another body on the osteopath section of the bill, and not because the committee members favored the bill in its entirety.

I am sorry that the time element made it necessary to rush this bill through the House, but on the basis of the emergency I presume we must bow to expediency.

It is my most fervent hope that the Surgeon General of the United States will administer this act, particularly the section relating to osteopaths, in his usually competent and realistic manner.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks by inserting a letter from Dr. Parran in regard to this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

OCTOBER 26, 1943.

Hon. A. L. BULWINKLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BULWINKLE: As the war progresses it becomes increasingly urgent that the Public Health Service have the benefit of the additional legislation contemplated in your bill, H. R. 3379, and in S. 400. While the more complete codification of the Public Health Service laws as contemplated in H. R. 3379 is highly desirable, some of our legislative needs are so urgent that I hope your committee will give consideration to the possibility of the prompt passage of S. 400.

You will recall that in testimony before your subcommittee on H. R. 649 I pointed out the need for reorganizing and simplifying the administrative structure of the Public Health Service. I also pointed out the fact that Public Health Service officers were serving on several of the battle fronts with our armed forces, and that an increasing number are on active and very hazardous duty with the Coast Guard, both on Coast Guard cutters and on landing barges. Yet our officers on these assignments do not have a clearly defined status under present law and there is some doubt as to whether or not their surviving dependents are entitled to benefits which accrue to surviving dependents of Army, Navy, and Coast Guard personnel.

Moreover, a considerable number of our medical and sanitary engineering officers are serving in the war zones but are not attached to the military forces. This is particularly true of a group of officers serving in north Africa and Italy on assignment to the State Department for epidemic control and health duties in connection with the civil population of occupied areas. These officers have absolutely no protection for themselves or their families. In fact, our regular officers, under present law, who are in this status are

excluded from both the benefits available to the military forces and to civil employees under the provisions of the United States employees' compensation laws.

The surviving dependents of none of our officers are entitled to the 6 months' pay and allowances which is provided by law for all of the other services (including the Coast and Geodetic Survey) paid in accordance with the provisions of the Joint Service Pay Act. As a result of war casualties several very pathetic cases have developed in which widows and children are left destitute. These cases are important in themselves. Moreover, failure of the Congress to provide some protection for them creates, as you well appreciate, a growing problem of morale which affects the whole corps. Our officers are subject to orders and must serve wherever assigned on any duty no matter how hazardous. They are doing this cheerfully, but in fairness to them, I feel I should bring to your attention the need for providing some measure of protection for them and their families in the event of disability or death in line of duty.

It is believed that section 8 of S. 400 needs revision in order to limit the benefits provided therein, so as to bring such benefits into accord with the statement of policy expressed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in his letter to the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, a copy of which is on file with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Your continued sympathetic interest in the problem facing the Public Health Service is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES FOR VETERANS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I present a report from the House Committee on Military Affairs on House Resolution 328.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to furnish the House of Representatives with the following information:

(1) The number of beds now available in all hospitals under the jurisdiction of the United States or the District of Columbia, or in private institutions under contract with the United States, and the number of bed patients in such hospitals;

(2) The number of beds to be available in hospitals now under construction by the United States, together with the approximate dates on which such hospitals will be placed in service;

(3) Plans for future construction of Government hospitals; and

(4) The maximum number of war casualties which it is estimated must be hospitalized at any one time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report may be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the committee report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT NO. 803 TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE RESOLUTION 328

The Committee on Military Affairs to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 328) requesting certain information from the President with respect to Government hospitals having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it be laid upon the table.

Your committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 328 (a privileged resolution), and having heard testimony

thereon, recommends to the House that the resolution be tabled.

The War Department produced testimony in answer to the numerous questions propounded in the resolution, and the other departments of Government concerned who were called upon for a report, have filed with the House Military Affairs Committee detailed information and answers to the various questions which reports are on file in the records of the committee and available for consideration and study by all Members of the House of Representatives.

The facts called for in the resolution and disclosed by the testimony before the committee by a witness on behalf of the War Department are of a confidential character and not for publication.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand this report is available to all Members of the House.

Mr. MAY. It is in the committee files.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is all I wanted, Mr. Speaker. I felt that the Members should know exactly how many beds were available now and how many beds would be available in the future because we must see that the veterans returning have an adequate number of beds as they come back and that we are building enough hospital facilities for the future. I congratulate the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MAY. I am sure that information will be available.

Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The motion was agreed to, and the resolution was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I was granted permission to insert in the RECORD a speech by the commander of the American Legion. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds the 2-page limit, that it will cost \$112.50 to print. I renew my request notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the matter may be printed.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects, in one to include an editorial in connection with harmonious labor conditions in San Francisco, and in the other matter in connection with the oil situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the renegotiation of war contracts and to include therein two letters and a short article on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and include a condensation of an address given before the American Bankers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 28—Czechoslovakian Independence Day—is an occasion for an understanding examination of the accomplishments of this valiant and progressive nation.

During 4 years of Nazi occupation, the Czechoslovak Republic has never ceased to exist de jure for the United States. At this very moment Czechoslovakia maintains accredited representatives in this country.

Thomas G. Masaryk, together with other Czechoslovakian leaders, brought forth the Czechoslovakian Declaration of Independence at Washington, D. C., on October 18, 1918. Later, on October 28, 1918, the Washington declaration was officially proclaimed in Prague. But even before the Washington declaration, Americans who shared Masaryk's proud traditions as well as his ancestry contributed to the greatness of the United States. Men and women who were born in the land of Masaryk have tilled American soil, developed American business and industry, and fought and died to perpetuate the American spirit of liberty.

Throughout almost 21 years of peaceful relations between the United States and the Czechoslovak Republic—prior to the Nazi invasion—the people of the Czechoslovak nation have impressed their friends in the United States with their high standard of decency and justice and the fair treatment of minorities.

When the Nazis invaded Czechoslovakia, those of us who knew the dauntless courage of her people realized that the Nazis might occupy the lands, but that they could never overpower the free will of Czechoslovaks. How well were our expectations attained! No matter what burdens of toil and torture were heaped upon them, the Czechoslovaks fought back. They fought back with every weapon at their disposal. In spite of all that Heydrich and Himmler could do to make life unendurable and death painful, the unwavering patriotism of the Czechoslovak people has survived. It strikes at the invader from the farms of Bohemia and Moravia, where Czechoslovak farmers hide their harvest or destroy it rather than have it fall into the hands of their oppressors. It strikes at the invader in the form of sabotage of locomotives, telegraph wires, and war production plants. Thousands have died for this resistance. Still it goes on. It is going on today within Czechoslovakia.

On the fighting fronts Czechoslovaks are arrayed against their Nazi foes. Czechoslovaks fought gallantly at To-

bruk. Czechoslovak pilots have escorted American bombers on missions over Germany. In many parts of the world Czechoslovaks fight for the same God-given liberties which inspire our own countrymen to battle.

On Czechoslovakian Independence Day—October 28, 1943—we of the United States honor our brave ally of Czechoslovakia, our sister republic, a land in which even the children are heroes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the other special orders today I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with the very able Member from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] in his tribute and in his expression of deep affection and high regard for Czechoslovakia. There is no more able Representative in the House than the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. We all know of his deep study of international questions.

I feel we owe a debt of gratitude to him for his many speeches in this House on the subject of Czechoslovakia and the Czech people. He has not only kept us well informed of conditions that exist in the district in Nebraska which he so well represents, but also regarding the conditions of the Czech people whom he knows and in whose welfare he is so deeply interested, both in the United States and Czechoslovakia. He is a member of the very powerful House Committee on Appropriations. With his fine knowledge of foreign countries, he has been an active and helpful influence in securing appropriations for our Foreign Service.

We know of President Masaryk's stay in the United States, we know of his admiration for our country, and we have a great admiration for him and his country. It was my privilege to know his son, Jan Masaryk, who was chargé d'affaires at the last World War period. As an indication of the friendliness and interest that he and his country showed for the United States, he discovered that the wounded World War veterans at a certain hospital liked red roses; so he used to send me at intervals red roses to take to our wounded veterans. That is typical of the kindness and friendliness of the people of Czechoslovakia. I want to pay high tribute to their courage and their wish for a government which is as free as ours, and I hope that that freedom may come soon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include part of an interview printed in the Youngstown Vindicator with our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

A SPEECH WHICH ALL SHOULD READ

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress and the country a very important speech which appears in the Appendix of the Record at page A4484. In recognition of the significance of this speech, it was inserted in the Record by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT. It is a broadcast delivered by the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. GERALD W. LANDIS, on the subject of The Great Food Muddle.

This speech is replete with important facts on one of the most serious problems confronting the country today. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] deserves the commendation of the country for having brought this matter to our attention in this way. I feel that his great work in helping to straighten out this food muddle and in reducing the waste of foodstuffs ranks with the remarkable work of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] in bringing about a reduction in other Government extravagances. I hope that insofar as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD circulates, every citizen will have the opportunity to read this revealing speech by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], who is one of the most active members of the special Republican food-study committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks in the Record; second, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may extend his remarks in the Record; and third, that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAN-

FIELD] may extend his own remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF MAJORITY LEADER ON NAVY DAY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] who is going to make a Navy Day speech today may precede all other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today after the other special orders heretofore granted have been disposed of for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

REVISION OF POSTAL RATE STRUCTURE

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the press and radio reported that the Ways and Means Committee of the House had undertaken to revise the postal rate structure. As ranking minority member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee may I say that I resent this action.

Early in the present Congress I introduced a resolution calling for the examination of the entire postal rate structure. Subsequent to that the chairman of our committee the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] requested a survey by the Post Office Department so that we might do the job in an efficient, intelligent manner. Up to the moment this report has not been received; therefore I doubt that any revision which the Ways and Means Committee may make at the present time is being done in a comprehensive manner and with full knowledge of all the facts and issues involved.

I hope we are not developing here in the House a group of "superduper" committees that are going to invade the prerogatives of established committees of the House. In my opinion, if the postal rates are to be revised, they should be revised by the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS: "LET US NOT BE PENNY-WISE AND POUND-FOOLISH"

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to you in regard to a subject that will face the thousands of our industries, and in particular the smaller ones, at the termination of the war; namely, "working capital" with which to convert to peacetime production, thereby helping to solve the difficult problem of unemployment that will face the country during the transition period.

For six weeks the Ways and Means Committee listened to witnesses from every type of industry and from every section of the Nation. Naturally, there were numerous complaints as to the arbitrary manner in which contracts were renegotiated with resultant reduction of expected profits. However, what seemed to be universally feared was that renegotiation before taxes, as practiced, did not allow the setting up of post-war reserves as provided in the 1942 tax bill.

Many small and middle-sized companies, under urge from the War or Navy Departments, are producing five or six times their pre-war output. Part of the working capital for this increased output has been supplied by Government guaranteed loans, but in most cases the company's own working capital has, in one way or another, become involved in the war effort, and is no longer available in the form of cash which will be so required for reconversion purposes once the war ends.

It is my belief that the Ways and Means Committee will give consideration to actually providing post-war reserves for companies that have been renegotiated. This was intended in the 1942 tax bill. The question that will shortly be before this House, and of even greater importance, if possible, than reserves, is the termination of war contracts and the settlement of the Government's liability thereunder in a speedy and definite manner.

Before giving consideration to accounting and legal details involved in the cancellation of war contracts, the Congress should give thought to the over-all subject of reconversion back to peacetime economy and how important to this reconversion is the proper handling of the question of termination of contracts.

It is my personal opinion that the war contracts belong to the war era and their speedy settlement will serve to bridge the gap between industry's war operations and industry's reconversion back to peacetime pursuits, which will provide sufficient jobs to absorb our present labor force, as well as providing jobs for our returning soldiers.

War is destructive. It is a destroyer of men we can never replace and we will never forget those who have given their lives in the service of their country. War is a destroyer of materials. Because we realize this we accept with as much equanimity as possible the loss of ships and guns and airplanes. Yet, except in the case of dereliction in duty, none of us would recommend a repayment by an

officer in charge of material lost or destroyed. If my premise that war contracts are part of the war era is correct, I think that we must approach contract cancellation with a certain openness of mind.

Our industries, like our soldiers and their officers, have done a monumental job, but once the guns stop firing another and equally important responsibility will face them. I have full confidence that with the same genius with which they converted from peace production to the manufacture of the materials of war, which caused our Army and Navy to be the best equipped in the history of all wars, and also provides supplies so liberally to our allies—with this same genius American industry will convert back to peace. To do this they must quickly settle old scores, have their working capital which is tied up in war inventories released to them in cash, and, above all, be assured that, except in the case of fraud or misstatement, a settlement is a settlement.

During the summer months and at the time of the hearings on renegotiation of contracts I had the occasion to talk to both procurement officers and contractors who had been renegotiated. From these conversations I came to two conclusions: First, that the procurement officers, after 2 years of experience, were a pretty competent lot and capable of doing a good job of cost accounting; second, that where contracts were terminated, and over 10,000 have so far been terminated by the War Department alone, the complaint seemed to be a lack of liberality and a close-fistedness on the part of the Government. This is a good sign as far as the general taxpayer is concerned. On the other hand, the contractor, who is also a citizen and a taxpayer and the provider of jobs, must have the right of appeal to a court or to special courts. In such a case not only justice but speed should be of the essence.

On October 15 Judge Patterson, Under Secretary of War, appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee. I feel that his statement, together with the draft of a bill for the termination of contracts, deserves the study of every Member of this body. I, myself, am deeply interested because of my membership on the committee that writes our tax legislation. Without fear of serious contradiction I can assure you, my colleagues, that unless we assume a broad-minded attitude on this subject of termination and are willing to admit in advance that there will be some inequalities and that some "chiselers" will "chisel," settlement of war contracts will be delayed due to trying to establish the last penny of claim. Delay will cause uncertainty as to the amount of working capital the company will really have available, which in turn will cause hesitation on the part of industry to undertake new commitments. As a result, business activity will decline, unemployment will develop, and you and I, my brothers, will have to appropriate funds for unemployment relief far in excess of any amount that might be lost to the Government through quick and final set-

tlement of war contracts. Let us strive to avoid any "penny wise, pound foolish" policy.

During the hearings on renegotiation of war contracts, complaint was expressed that the procurement officers and renegotiators had no definite set of regulations on which settlements were based. Apparently this objection has been recognized, as the Under Secretary in his statement of October 15 recommends the creation of an interdepartmental committee to adopt uniform regulations for termination of contracts. Based upon these regulations, together with the experience gained by procurement officers in making contracts and later on renegotiating them, there should be no great difficulty in arriving at a negotiated agreement for cancellation.

The bill offered by the War Department provided for partial payments on account of contract termination prior to final settlement up to 90 percent of the certified claim. Payment may be made to the prime contractor or directly to a subcontractor. This is a most important feature of the bill and will bring quick relief to many small companies whose financial set-up might not be sufficiently strong to await a termination of settlement of its prime contractor. Provision is made in the bill to charge 6 percent interest on any overpayment and to have the overpayment considered as a loan callable on demand.

The bill also contains provisions for financing reconversion requirements through commercial bank loans guaranteed by designated departments of the Government when necessary. Personally, I believe that the system of government guaranty should be eliminated as rapidly as possible. The commercial banks of the country are in a strong position as far as commercial loans are concerned. This will afford them the opportunity to get back into the banking business and, in cooperation with investment banking houses, help finance the return to post-war peacetime economy.

There remain two important items of the War Department bill and Judge Patterson's statement. The bill authorizes advance or partial payments to contractors in settlement of termination claims. It is my belief that these payments should be mandatory upon the presentation of a certificate or sworn statement of the contractor which he has drafted and based upon the aforementioned interdepartmental committee uniform regulations. These payments which are in the nature of a loan without interest would, of course, be liquidated by payments received in settlement. Any overpayment or excess loan should bear 6 percent interest until repaid, and be callable upon demand.

The final item and one that will probably cause considerable discussion is the right of the Comptroller General to post audit all settlements.

Judge Patterson, in his statement, quotes authority for his belief that the procurement departments may make contracts as well as terminate them without independent review. Not being a lawyer, I would scarcely have the pre-

sumption to pass upon the legal merits of the question as they exist. I do, however, have a very profound conviction that the only way of preventing our national economy from going into a tail-spin is by a quick reconversion of industry back to peacetime pursuits. This absolutely cannot be done if any fear exists in the minds of businessmen that the termination contract they have made is not final, and that there is a chance that the money they are using to start a new peacetime venture and pay the wages of their workmen may be taken from them due to a post audit by an independent bureau of the Government.

During the past 7 weeks or more I have listened as a member of the Ways and Means Committee to the testimony of many witnesses. I have heard the industries of our great country black-guarded as being selfish and greedy; I have heard them extolled. After all, and with considered thought, I believe American industrial management is 99½ percent what we are proud it is—fighters, full of manufacturing genius, leaders in social welfare due to enlightened self-interest, and last but not least, the people who have built our great country and given jobs at the highest wages ever known to countless thousands and who, if given a chance, will provide opportunity to our returning soldiers and sailors.

Let us not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a certain element of the radical press, including PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, is now lambasting certain Members of the United States Senate, including our former distinguished colleague, Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for bringing out a resolution that, in my opinion, more nearly expresses the will of the American people than anything that has yet been suggested. The so-called Fulbright resolution was not submitted to the House for amendments, but was rushed through under suspension of the rules, which deprived us of any opportunity to amend or change it in any way. It denied us the opportunity to even offer a motion to recommit or any chance to change or correct it in any way whatsoever.

In my opinion, if the Connally resolution and the Fulbright resolution were

both put up to the Members of this House and a vote taken as between the two, the Connally resolution would be chosen by a majority of at least three or four to one over the Fulbright provisions.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3366.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MILLER of Connecticut and Mr. MURDOCK asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in relation to what our friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] has just said with reference to the termination of war contracts, I wish to add a thought with respect to the liquidation of inventories—goods, plants, machinery, and so forth—which the Government will probably have on hand, which are now estimated to range in the neighborhood of \$75,000,000,000, as against an approximately \$7,000,000,000 inventory which the Government had on hand at the end of World War No. 1. Adding to the inventory of \$75,000,000,000 the estimated \$75,000,000,000 of contracts which will have to be terminated will give us a rough figure of \$150,000,000,000, based on today's estimates made by some of our students and experts. It seems to me it will be necessary for Congress to enact legislation setting up a liquidation board of some kind or another, because I believe the figures show that in 1940 the total manufactured products of this country amounted to about \$76,000,000,000, so with the plants and equipment and inventories we shall have almost as much

as the total value of the manufactured goods in this country say in 1940 amounted to. If we liquidate at the rate of \$500,000,000 per month, it will take us many years to handle the job.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, since the question of the termination of war contracts has been raised on the floor today, I feel it proper at this time to say to the House that the Committee on Military Affairs is today completing hearings on the pending legislation on the subject. We are all perfectly aware of the gravity of the problem involved. The gentleman from Illinois said the termination of these war contracts is going to be one of the greatest problems of these times. I wish to add to his statement by saying that it is right now one of the grave problems of these times. We are going into executive session within a few hours for the purpose of trying to write legislation that will be fair to the contractors and fair to the Government, and that we hope will be a proper solution of this grave and important question.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 344)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and referred to the Committee on Education and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 13, 1942, on signing the bill calling for the induction by Selective Service of young men 18 and 19 years old, I appointed a committee of educators, under the auspices of the War and Navy Departments, to study the problem of education of our service men and women after the war. The objective was to enable those young people, whose education had been interrupted, to resume their schooling, and to provide an opportunity for the education and technical training of other young men and women of ability, after their discharge from the armed services.

This committee has sent me a preliminary report which I am herewith transmitting to the Congress for its consideration, and, I hope, for its early action.

We, at home, owe a special and continuing obligation to these men and women in the armed services.

During the war we have seen to it that they have received the best training and equipment, the best food, shelter, and medical attention, the best protection and care which planning, ingenuity, physical resources, and money could furnish in time of war. But after the war shall have been won, the best way that we can repay a portion of that debt is to see to it, by planning and by action now, that those men and women are demobilized into an economy which is sound and prosperous, with a minimum of unemployment and dislo-

cation; and that, with the assistance of government, they are given the opportunity to find a job for which they are fitted and trained, in a field which offers some reasonable assurance of well-being and continuous employment.

For many, what they desire most in the way of employment will require special training and further education. As a part of a general program for the benefit of the members of our armed services, I believe that the Nation is morally obligated to provide this training and education and the necessary financial assistance by which they can be secured. It is an obligation which should be recognized now; and legislation to that end should be enacted as soon as possible.

This is a good time not merely to be thinking about the subject but actually to do something about it. Nothing will be more conducive to the maintenance of high morale in our troops than the knowledge that steps are being taken now to give them education and technical training when the fighting is over.

Every day that the war continues interrupts the schooling and training of more men and women and deprives them of the education and skills which they would otherwise acquire for use in later life. Not only the individual welfare of our troops but the welfare of the Nation itself requires that we reverse this trend just as quickly as possible after the war.

Vocational and educational opportunities for veterans should be of the widest range. There will be those of limited education who now appreciate, perhaps for the first time, the importance of general education, and who would welcome a year in school or college. There will be those who desire to learn a remunerative trade or to fit themselves more adequately for specialized work in agriculture or commerce. There will be others who want professional courses to prepare them for their life's work.

Lack of money should not prevent any veteran of this war from equipping himself for the most useful employment for which his aptitudes and willingness qualify him. The money invested in this training and schooling program will reap rich dividends in higher productivity, more intelligent leadership, and greater human happiness.

We must replenish our supply of persons qualified to discharge the heavy responsibilities of the post-war world. We have taught our youth how to wage war; we must also teach them how to live useful and happy lives in freedom, justice, and decency.

Specifically, I agree with the recommendations made by the committee in this regard, as follows:

1. The Federal Government should make it financially feasible for every man and woman who has served honorably for a minimum period in the armed forces since September 16, 1940, to spend a period up to 1 calendar year in a school, a college, a technical institution, or in actual training in industry, so that he can further his education, learn a trade, or acquire the necessary knowledge and skill for farming, commerce, manufacturing, or other pursuits.

2. In addition, the Federal Government should make it financially possible for a limited number of ex-servicemen and women selected for their special aptitudes, to carry on their general, technical, or professional education for a further period of 1, 2, or 3 years.

This assistance from Government should include not only cost of instruction but a certain amount of money for maintenance.

One incidental benefit of permitting discharged veterans to put in a year or more of schooling or training would be to simplify and cushion the return to civilian employment of service personnel. And I might call to your attention the fact that it costs less per year to keep a man at school or college or training on the job than to maintain him on active military duty for a year.

While the Federal Government should provide the necessary funds and should have the responsibility of seeing that they are spent providently and under generally accepted standards, the control of the educational processes and the certification of trainees and students should reside in the States and localities.

I am sure that the Congress will agree with me that the report of this committee constitutes a helpful and constructive point of departure in the working out of a practical program for the meeting of this situation. Various recommendations are contained in the report concerning the administration of the plan. While there may be differences as to some of the details, I am confident that the Congress will find merit in the general objectives.

So far as disabled soldiers are concerned, the Congress is aware that, pursuant to existing statutes, the Veterans' Administration is prepared to conduct a program of rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disability. The program is designed to provide for the special needs of war-disabled veterans, and to furnish educational and training opportunities to help them take their places in civilian life. The program has already been initiated, and will be expanded as the war proceeds. The new program of the Federal Security Agency will make provisions for veterans whose disabilities are not service connected.

The Army and the Navy require a large number of workers skilled and experienced in various occupations and professions. Men who are filling these posts are acquiring valuable training and experience. A man who has become a mechanical draftsman, a cartographer, a meteorologist, a cook, or a baker may succeed in finding a similar post in civilian life. In a great many other occupations, such as those dealing with tank or tractor maintenance and repair, or with radio operation and maintenance, men are acquiring basic skill and experience which will provide a solid foundation for learning a related civilian occupation.

In addition, the United States Armed Forces Institute, which is a joint operation of the Army and Navy, offers men and women in the armed services a chance to enroll in courses usually offered

by colleges, high schools, technical, and occupational schools, in which they can study in their off-duty time. The institute prepares self-teaching textbooks which enable them to learn a subject entirely on their own initiative; or, if they prefer, they may join any one of hundreds of classes which have or are being established in Army camps and posts and in Navy installations, and in Army and Navy hospitals, here in the United States and in places all over the world. Or, if they wish, they can study by the correspondence method with the institute or with one of its overseas branches the same as any student in a correspondence school.

Opportunities for vocational training and for systematic schooling within the armed services will be expanded and re-oriented during periods of demobilization and up to the moment of discharge.

Therefore, if the Congress adopts the general objective outlined herein, our men and women in the armed forces will be afforded opportunities for continuance of their education and vocational training—first, during the war, second, during the demobilization period, and, third, for a year or more after their separation from the service.

While the successful conclusion of this great war is by no means within our sight, yet it may well be said that the time to prepare for peace is at the height of war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 27, 1943.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for 15 minutes.

OUR NAVY AND NAVY DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that, on this Navy Day, 1943, the floor of this House should be used as a rostrum from which to pay a tribute to the United States Naval Service, consisting of our Navy, our Coast Guard, and our Marine Corps.

The resources and effort and manpower of this Nation have been used to the utmost, since the beginning of the national emergency, to build this country's seapower into the biggest, most effective, and hardest-hitting naval force the world has ever known.

On this second Navy Day of our Nation during wartime, we can point with pride to our Navy's ships and submarines

and planes. They are equal or superior to any similar types under any other flag, both as to quantity and quality. But we are, of course, proudest of all of the officers and men who man those ships, those submarines, and those naval planes. We can point with equal pride to the men and the women in the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps. They are our own people, members of our own families, our relatives, and our close friends. They are Americans all.

On this occasion—using information made available by the Navy Department at my request—I would like to speak of the size of our Naval Service, both as to manpower and matériel. I would like to describe some of the Navy's accomplishments at sea, on the home front, and in a field about which very little has yet been told—our Navy's assistance to the navies of our allies. And, particularly, I would like to say something about the spirit of the Navy men who are now at battle stations on all the seas of the globe.

After slightly less than 2 years at war, our Navy can point to many accomplishments.

The Mediterranean is no longer an Axis lake. It is a United Nations' highway to Russia, India, and the entire Asiatic area.

We are slowly winning the Battle of the Atlantic. According to Navy Department figures, there were fewer losses to German submarines in September than for any month since the beginning of the war. In fact, there is reason to believe that, during September, Hitler lost more submarines than we lost merchant ships—and that is a rate which means suicide for the German undersea effort.

In all the landings in Africa, Sicily, and Italy proper, the United States Navy has helped supply the original punch which put our troops and equipment ashore. And, on more than one occasion, the guns of our warships have battered attacking German troops and tanks, allowing our men to hold the beach heads they had won at great cost in effort and in human life.

In the Pacific, we have broken the back of the Jap attack—the Jap offensive has been stopped on every front. Today our joint Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard forces are pushing the Jap back to his final battlefields in the very heart of the Rising Sun.

Recently, you have read of the attacks by our Navy sea-air task forces on some of the Jap-held strongholds in the central Pacific. This week I have been informed that, through the proper concentration of our vastly increased Pacific forces, it is now possible for the Navy to establish air superiority—at least temporarily—over any one of Japan's central Pacific strongholds, and at any time our Navy desires to do so. Less than 2 years ago, you will remember, the Japs were able to advance at will almost to the gateway of Australia to the south, and far into the Aleutians on the north.

Navy Day, this year, is vastly different from last year and the year before. Our days on the defensive have passed.

This year the Japs are having to take it—when we can find them—whether they like it or not.

Today the total personnel of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard is approximately two and a half million men, with more than 2,000,000 in the Navy, approximately 320,000 in the Marine Corps, and approximately 160,000 in the Coast Guard. This is well over 10 times the size of this force in July of 1940. It is approximately 4 times the approximate Navy figure attained at this Nation's peak during the First World War. Included in this total are approximately 50,000 WAVES, SPARS, and women MARINES.

During the past 3 years, the Navy has trained over a million and a half officers and men. As of July 1, 1943, a total of 17,437 officers and 167,886 enlisted men were in training. The percentage of officers trained in the last fiscal year rose 267 percent over the year before. Similarly, the percentage of enlisted personnel trained in the last fiscal year rose 173 percent over the year before.

The Navy college program V-12 was created to maintain a continuing flow to the Navy of young officers. There are 77,000 young men now in the colleges and universities throughout the country in the V-12 program. This program is administered in selected institutions under contract to the Navy for instruction, housing, messing, and other facilities. The Navy contracted for existing facilities and fitted the V-12 program into existing college patterns. The object of this training is to provide the basic educational background necessary for the assimilation of the technical and profound knowledge required of Navy officers. Following the successful completion of V-12, prospective midshipmen attend a Navy midshipman school. There are 4 of these throughout the country, located at the following places: The Naval Academy, Columbia University, Northwestern University, and the University of Notre Dame. These schools were originated at the suggestion of President Roosevelt when he was the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and they are now the Navy's principal source of new seagoing officers.

The Navy has in operation a program of voluntary in-service education. This is designed to utilize "thinking" time, which is the time officers and men are off duty and wonder what to do, and what will happen to them after the war is over. This program includes both correspondence courses of study, and also group instruction at educational service centers. These have been established at many outlying bases, such as training stations and naval hospitals. They offer opportunities for studying anything from professional Navy subjects to bookkeeping and foreign languages. Correspondence courses offer a wide variety of subjects as well and also lead to high school and college credits. In other words, the Navy is not only training men to do better jobs in the Navy—these men are receiving an education which will fit them for better jobs after the war.

Of course, mere numbers cannot begin to tell the story of the United States

Navy as a sea-air fighting team. This is best told in reference to the spirit of the Navy's fighting men—men who are carrying on the tradition of John Paul Jones, Stephen Decatur, Perry, and Farragut. A brief anecdote will help illustrate this point.

In the early days of this war, when the Japs had the upper hand in the Pacific, one of our destroyers was commanded by a Massachusetts man, Capt. L. A. Abercrombie, of Lawrence, Mass. Captain Abercrombie tells the story of a day when his ship was patrolling in Japanese waters. Two torpedoes were observed heading for the ship. They missed, just barely. The ship was heeled over to dodge two more Jap torpedoes. The ship's "talker" was describing the action over the loudspeaker.

From down in the bowels of the ship came the excited voice of an engineer, who either could not hear what the "talker" was saying or who could not believe what he had heard. "Repeat, repeat," screamed the engineer.

"Two Jap torpedoes just missed the ship," repeated the "talker." There was a brief silence from below, and then came these words: "Let us go get the blankety-blank. But do not tell me any more—you might scare me." I am happy to add that—P. S.—Captain Abercrombie's ship did "get the blankety-blank."

Now for some figures on ships and planes: Today the United States Fleet constitutes by far the largest sea force in all the history of the world. This fleet consists of approximately 15,000 vessels of all types and more than 20,000 naval planes. Of the Navy's ships, more than 800 are hard-hitting combat types, exclusive of landing craft, auxiliaries, tenders, and other such smaller vessels. Of the Navy's planes, by far the larger majority are first-line combat aircraft, equal and superior to anything they have faced thus far in this war. The figures on the production of this gigantic fleet are perhaps now familiar to you. It is interesting to point out, however, that this flood of production is just now reaching its full tide and is scheduled to continue at its present maximum rate. During the 4 months in the second half of 1943, beginning with July of this year, Navy production has more than doubled the totals achieved in the entire 6 months of the first half of this year.

In speaking of the Navy's program of new building, however—and the almost unbelievable achievements in this field—there is another side of the story about which very little has been told up to this time. I refer to the maintenance, overhaul, and repair of battle damage to our own ships, and particularly the work we have done on the navies of the United Nations.

I am informed that the spirit of co-operation between our Navy and the navies of our allies has been splendid throughout.

Not long ago the announcement was made in London that at one time the British Mediterranean Fleet could put forward only three cruisers which were in combat condition. The Italian Fleet was overwhelmingly superior. Since that fleet is no longer in opposition to

our forces, and since much of the remnants of Hitler's shrinking sea power have been immobilized, it can now be safely told that for a large part of this war the navy yards of the United States have been used as repair bases for the British Navy and the navies of other United Nations.

From the beginning of the lend-lease program on March 11, 1941, United States navy yards have repaired foreign combatant vessels under the flags of England, France, Poland, Russia, Cuba, Venezuela, Ecuador, Chile, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Belgium, Norway, Mexico, Colombia, Nicaragua, Canada, and Greece. This work has been done in 10 navy yards in the United States and outside the continental limits, and in more than 20 private shipyards within this country. Under this program of aid to our allies, more than 80 large combatant ships have been overhauled, outfitted, or repaired after damage in battle. Of these foreign warships, there have been approximately 7 aircraft carriers, 10 battleships, 27 cruisers, 40 destroyers, almost 30 corvettes, and numerous smaller types.

One British aircraft carrier came into a United States navy yard so badly damaged as a result of combat with the Axis forces in the Atlantic that this ship required 6 months to place back in commission. Not only had this carrier been heavily bombed, she had been swept by fire that almost gutted the ship as a result of bombing.

A United Nations' cruiser now under repair had both the bow and the stern blown off. Two other Allied cruisers came into United States yards with the bows blown off. Another foreign cruiser is now under overhaul with the stern blown off.

A British destroyer which had received action damage came into port with the keel buckled about 18 inches. This would be a long drydock job and in order not to tie up a dock for this length of time, the ship was sent to the navy yard, Charleston, where a new drydock was being built. The ship went into the drydock with the first flooding of the dock. Work on the ship was undertaken at the same time the egress and entrance to the dock were being completed.

These are merely a few of the instances of our aid to the navies of the United Nations, about which little has been told in the past. Actually, almost 20 percent of all the repair and overhaul work in American navy yards has been done on foreign warships. This work, especially in the beginning, taxed the resourcefulness of our yards in adapting United States methods and materials to the requirements and specifications of foreign naval services. For instance, our workmen had to learn that on a British ship, a portable electric cable is a "wandering lead," that on a French ship a cylinder head is a "chemise," and that in Spanish, spare parts are known as "refreshments." One of our overhaul problems was in itself a seagoing league of nations. This problem concerned 10 gunboats which had been built in Spain, to British specifications, which had French guns, German engines, and

which belonged to the Government of Mexico. The technical difficulties in these repair problems were almost staggering to the imagination. But, in keeping the ships of our allies in fighting trim, we were thereby adding to the strength of the sea force opposed to the Axis, and we were gaining time while building up our own forces.

Even before Pearl Harbor the Navy realized that the larger fleet which was being built as a result of the national emergency would require vastly increased repair facilities and personnel to keep this enlarged fleet in operation. To meet this situation our navy yard working forces were doubled, tripled, and then quadrupled as fast as men could be recruited. When skilled men were no longer available, untrained men and women were brought in to work alongside the skilled, until they could pick up their share of the work load. As an example, the force at one of our east coast navy yards expanded from 1,500 in 1937 to almost 30,000 in 1943. One of our larger navy yards now employs approximately 70,000 workers, and the forces are still increasing.

During 1 month of this year, there were 436 naval vessels under repair in 9 navy yards working on repair and overhaul jobs which cost a total of \$20,000,000. In many cases, where important units of the fighting fleet are needed by specified dates, the yard personnel has virtually accomplished the impossible in meeting the dead line. There are many unsung heroes among our yard workmen and foremen who have worked long, hard hours to get a ship back to the battle line in record time.

But on this Navy Day it would not be logical or proper for me to talk to you about ships alone, or about the civilian workers who build and repair these ships.

The lion's share of the credit for all of the Navy's achievements thus far in the war properly goes to the Navy's fighting men, working shoulder to shoulder with the fighting men of the other two branches of the naval service—the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard.

Let us review briefly some of the accomplishments of these fighting men since that black Sunday morning of December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, not quite 2 years ago.

No American will ever forget the heroic stand of the Marines on Wake Island. Outnumbered, their supplies, equipment, and ammunition almost gone, they were asked in a radio message what they wanted. And the message flashed back—"Send us more Japs."

In May of 1942 the Japs were advancing in every direction throughout the Pacific. Australia had the invasion jitters—and well she might have had. The Japs were headed in that direction, and the Japs had not yet been stopped. The Japs had crushed their way into Hong Kong. They had captured the Philippines. They had moved into French Indochina and into Burma. They had not halted at the great and supposedly impregnable bastion of Sing-

apore. They had raped and gutted the Netherlands East Indies. The Japs at no point had been checked or stopped. And the Japs' taunting cry rang out—"Where is the United States Navy?"

Well, the Japs got the answer to that question in May of 1942 as they moved their invasion fleet into the Coral Sea, presumably aimed at an Australian conquest. The United States Navy was there to greet them with fireworks. The Jap fleet was routed, part of it sent to the bottom of the Coral Sea, and Australia—although not yet out of danger—could afford to breathe a little easier.

Maybe the Japs thought the Battle of the Coral Sea was an accident—or maybe they believed their own propaganda when they claimed that the United States Navy had been crippled for good at Pearl Harbor. At any rate, just 1 month later they tried it again. This time the thrust came at Midway. The Japs aimed their blow with the biggest invasion fleet in the history of modern warfare—a total of more than 80 ships of all kinds. Quite a few of those ships will never see Japan again—among them 4 of Japan's best aircraft carriers—because they are now on the bottom of the sea off Midway. The Japs now knew where they could find the United States Navy.

The next move was up to us, and we made it—we threw an invasion force into the Solomon Islands. For more than 3 months the Japs used every trick and every combination of force at their command in an effort to retake the Solomon invasion points. You know the result. Today "Guadalcanal" is an American household word. And we are steadily pushing forward in the south Pacific area, just as we pushed forward in the Aleutians until the battered Jap forces turned tail and retreated toward Tokyo.

Today our Pacific sea and air forces no longer worry so much about where the Japs will strike next. They are worrying about where they can find the Japs next. And the Navy has shown us, in terms of battles fought and won, that the best defense is to attack, both in the Pacific and the Atlantic.

The Navy has added to our national traditions such words as "Midway," "Guadalcanal," "the Coral Sea," and others which future Americans will find large in their history books. And other such names are now in the making—with battle plans already completed, and with officers and men waiting only for the signal to go. After a recent Navy raid on the Marcus Islands, a Japanese propaganda announcer told the Japanese people that they must work and fight harder, because the Marcus Island raid could just as easily have been made on Japan itself. So far, gentlemen—and I have made inquiries in this regard—the United States Navy has not seen fit to call this Japanese spokesman a liar. There is every reason to believe that the future of our naval operations holds great battles—perhaps with great losses—but also certain to provide great advances forward in the over-all pattern of final and ultimate destruction of the Japanese military power in the Pacific.

We know that there will be no lack of spirit on the part of the men who are called on to perform their share of the sacrifice and effort needed for victory. Here is just one example—told for the first time—of this fighting spirit on the part of our Navy men. This story concerns a Navy Seabee, member of a naval construction battalion—those men who land with the marines and build the advance bases—the men who fight with a monkey wrench or a shovel in one hand and a tommy gun in the other.

At an advance base in the southwest Pacific, Seabee Richard Herman Maurer, of Seattle, Wash., was reported absent without leave late in July. Maurer was absent without leave until the end of August, at which time he was called before a court martial and asked to explain his conduct.

It developed he had gone A. W. O. L. only because he saw a chance to get in a crack at the Japs. Leaving his island base, he attached himself to a party of marine raiders who had been ordered on a daring mission into the Japs' own territory, an island in Japanese-held waters. Here is a paraphrase of the report turned in by the marine commanding officer, and which has been furnished to me by the Navy Department:

During the attack on the Japanese, Seabee Maurer displayed outstanding qualities of courage and heroism as a member of a machine gun squad, manning a machine gun alone when every other man in the gun crew was killed or wounded. He serviced this gun under heavy enemy machine gun, rifle, and mortar fire. His actions at all times were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Naval Service. He is herewith recommended for the award of the Silver Star for gallantry in action against the Japanese enemy.

That is just one example. There are thousands of others in the battles which have made the United States Navy supreme on every sea where the battles are now raging. But there are examples in our own land, too, of the heroism which comes with sacrifice—the wives now without husbands and children without fathers; the parents whose sons are represented by a gold star in the window; the thousands of patriotic Americans who are reminded of loved ones by a white cross in the Solomons or the beaches of Africa or Italy.

On this Navy Day, 1943, we know that we have a great Navy—and we know that it will show itself to be even greater as this war goes on. All our best naval and military authorities tell me that the battles which still lie ahead will be long and hard. We do not know how long this war will last, or how much it will cost in national wealth and human life. But we are on our way. We know that victory—no matter how long it takes—is certain. And on this Navy Day, we can strive for nothing higher than the pledge that we as a Nation will live up to the heroism and sacrifice that the men of our Navy have already written in our history—to stand as long as our flag shall wave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORRELL). Under previous order of the

House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, when I asked for the time today to discuss very briefly the question of subsidies, I had that thought only from something that had been said here about a week ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]. The gentleman, in talking about subsidies, had said that he approved generally of the subject of subsidies. Then he made this statement, which I thought might be a text for what I was going to say:

I hesitate to speak with any authority about the farmer, because I know so little from practical experience about farming.

If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] were here today it was my intention to say to him, and to assure him that I am not speaking too seriously, that perhaps it is fortunate for the gentleman from Pennsylvania and for myself, and for many other Members of the Congress of the United States that it is not necessary that we should know personally about farming in order to realize that the present policy of subsidies will be a failure, is a failure, and for 1,600 years has been a failure on every successive attempt to use it. If the gentleman were here, I would like to point out to him that we can go back as far as the time of Diocletian, who had some of the same ideas the administrative agencies have today in Washington. The ideas have changed very little over 1,600 years. There is one mark of similarity in them in that they were failures in his day and failures today, and so I have here quotations from a number of books, speaking of that period, and I quote from them. One says that Diocletian fixed a maximum price for foods and other articles of commerce. He, however, did something which the present agencies have not yet come to. He fixed at that time a maximum price for wages. I skip the comments of this author and quote merely his conclusion:

The effect was disastrous. It brought about disturbance in the food supply, and many traders were ruined.

There are other quotations, all of them coming to the same conclusion.

Another author says that the same expedient has been tried before and has been often tried since, and that as a temporary measure in a critical time it might be of some use, but as a general measure it is certain to do great harm, and then he says "will cause great bloodshed," which I am glad to say has ceased to be the effect over the period of 1,600 years.

So I turn to another comment on the conditions of that time from a man who is even more in favor of the idea than the previous author. He says that "probably the idea failed because it was too simple and too rigid in that it made no allowance for the necessary differences between wholesale and retail prices and for the cost of transportation, and for seasonal variations," which is something that we can take out of the historical

comments 1,600 years ago and apply easily to 1943.

Unfortunately, a little different situation has come onto the floor since I asked for time. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] was very sincere and spoke very well. However, in the peripatetic appearance of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], he has been speaking on the subject of subsidies, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 1925, that gentleman says:

The inconsistency and what borders at least upon hypocrisy is the fact that the so-called opponents of subsidies have said that they are against all subsidies.

And so on, indicating that there is an inconsistency in that some feel that subsidies may be applied to one purpose and not to another. I suggest that it is a serious thing to accuse the Congress of the United States of inconsistency and of hypocrisy, and so I turn back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18, and I quote the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], in which he said:

On the general proposition of subsidies ordinarily I am against subsidies. I do not think it is the right approach.

Then he says—and I wish to include the entire quotation—

Now we are at war, and in some way we must keep down inflation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from the act, which is being used by the administrative agencies for the purpose of applying, and I say without authority, subsidies in the present effort to keep down the cost of living. I repeat that this has been tried many times, and I shall say again, has never been successful.

There is one element that enters into it which the gentleman from Texas ignores. If the gentleman from Texas is to speak after me today, I wish him to speak upon this point, and not to evade this point, but to speak directly upon this point. That is, that the whole idea of the present subsidy program of the administration is to maintain and to increase production. I challenge any Member of the Congress, I challenge the gentleman from Texas, to tell me where once in the history of the world a subsidy program, as now applied, has ever maintained production and ever increased production.

So I read from the Executive order itself. The Executive order is dated April 8, 1943. This is the famous "hold the line" order. I do not know what it holds, but it does not hold any line. This is a résumé of the order rather than the language. I quote:

Nothing in the order was to prevent either of them from making such readjustments in price relationships appropriate for various commodities or classes or qualities or grades thereof, or for various marketing areas, or from authorizing such support prices, subsidies, or other inducements—

And this is the only way in which subsidies were to be offered—

as may be authorized by law or may be deemed necessary to maintain or to increase production.

The point that I am making today in the brief time at my disposal—and I wish I had taken more; however, the gentleman from Texas had not spoken when I asked for time—the point I am making is that the whole theory of the subsidy program is to maintain and to increase production, which it will not do, which every farmer knows it will not do, and which the representative of every farming area knows it will not do, and which, therefore, will have a most tragic effect upon rural areas.

So we turn to the nation which is the highest example of regimentation, in my opinion, which exists in the world today. That is Germany. Germany began back in 1933 with the ideas of regimentation and of subsidies and of the control of the production of foods. I went to Germany in the summer of 1935 to see just exactly what had been done. We might divide that experiment into two parts. The first part was from 1925 to 1933. We could go back to 1925, but let us start with the coming of the Third Reich in Germany, and quote people who have sympathetically written about it.

Only after 1933—

Says this writer—

did subsidies become a conscious part of the Germany policy. Before the advent of the Nazi government there were only a few disconnected measures, and since then agriculture has been subjected to a more or less comprehensive program for self-sufficiency. One survey of Germany's attempt has shown that on the whole, agricultural production has not been increased and imports have not been materially reduced.

I would like to read more but the idea is the same. It is the conclusion we are interested in today.

Another writer:

Even in 1936 Germany was still compelled to import about 20 percent of her foodstuffs.

Thus, says he:

The idea has contributed nothing toward agricultural self-sufficiency during the period of its experimental control.

Another one:

The drive, initiated since 1933 for complete agricultural self-sufficiency, has failed—

And I interpolate—

by the subsidy plan.

Here we have a German writer who says:

Since 1933 the German Government has spent large amounts on subsidies to increase production in order to make Germany self-sufficient with respect to foods. In spite of these subsidies, there is no essential increase of agricultural production to be expected for many years.

Another one, and this is an English writer, says:

In spite of all these efforts the Nazi agricultural policy has been a failure, both in the economic and in the social field.

Another one:

Despite all promises and efforts to the contrary, Nazi agricultural policy is leading therefore to an almost complete destruction of the liberty and social position of the independent farmers.

There is nothing new about a subsidy program. There is nothing that we do not already know, including its ultimate failure.

Italy tried the same thing under the same system of regimentation. This writer says:

Despite constant propaganda, coercion, and various subsidies, there has been little, if any, increase in land utilization, crop yields, or the number of livestock. In 1932 there were 29,372,000 hectares under cultivation; in 1937 this area was reduced to 28,742,000 hectares.

That is exactly what is happening in the United States and will happen under this program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman believe that the subsidy program in Germany and Italy was tried out largely to get political support for the Nazi administration, rather than to increase production?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is the gentleman suggesting that is the same basis of the subsidy policy in the United States?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, history repeats.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It has been said to, yes. However, let us turn to the efforts of Great Britain, which, with these same examples—of all times—before it, was not led into this mistaken idea of subsidies into which we are being led, but which said to the farmers of England, "Produce." As a consequence, the farmers produced. I quote:

The Minister of Agriculture announced that he would provide farmers with a guaranty of fixed prices for food produced during the war and for 1 year after its conclusion. This guaranty has provided a strong impetus to farmers to produce maximum crops.

A recent increase of sown land to 18,000,000 acres represents a 40-percent improvement over the pre-war figures.

Mr. Speaker, my time is running out faster than I had hoped. It seems to me almost as though the clock had been speeded up. I should like to submit the results on France, with which I am also personally familiar, taking the years 1935 and 1937, on the opposite swing of the pendulum—that is, when they had too much grain. They decided to purchase grain by injecting the government into the picture. They tried to control the production of grain, and I ask you to believe me, Mr. Speaker, with even more disastrous results. When I was there the grain was costing something like \$2.09 a bushel to the consumer, \$1.91 to the farmer, and \$1.18 to the livestock men. In fact, I saw quoted in the same paper over there the Government price on grain and the black market price on grain. It was called "le gangster blé"—"gangster wheat"—they having taken that name from the United States, which I am somewhat inclined to view as a dubious honor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day next Monday and special orders heretofore entered I may

again have 20 minutes to continue what I really want to lay before the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I shall merely say so that the gentleman from Texas may be adequately warned that I shall then point out to him that in the issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17 last the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] had a little exchange on the floor. The gentleman from Texas said:

The O. P. A. has made a lot of mistakes.

I can agree with that. He said:

We are nearer run-away inflation than we have ever been before.

I say I agree with that but that we attribute it to different reasons. I attribute it to the present system of subsidies, plus the present system of uncontrolled incomes, plus insufficient production. I say that combination is the greatest incentive to run-away inflation this Nation has ever known in its entire history. Then the gentleman from Texas said:

There is not a Member of this House listening now, or a Member of this House who would vote to repeal the price- and the rent-control law. I do not believe there is a single one who would do it.

And the gentleman from Mississippi said:

The gentleman cannot speak for the whole of the Congress on that proposition.

Which I think is a statement of fact. The gentleman from Texas then said:

I am not speaking for the whole Congress.

He further said:

Is the gentleman opposed to price control?

And so forth. And the gentleman from Mississippi said:

I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I opposed the law originally. I would repeal it now and I would go back to the program followed in the First World War.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time next Monday in order to point out that the program followed in the First World War was a sound program. It was a program inaugurated under a Democratic administration, it was a successful program, and we should return to it now, as nearly as it would be possible to return to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make today and to include therein certain tables and other excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech made by Mr. Thurman W. Van Metre, economist and professor of transportation at Columbia University. I am advised by the Public Printer that this will cost \$157.50.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES—NO OTHER WAY TO HOLD DOWN THE COST OF LIVING AND ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, to my mind there is only one way to keep down the cost of living, prevent inflation, and encourage needed production, and that is by the payment of subsidies. This question has been pictured to the country as being a new one, but the first act of a general nature passed by the American Congress more than 150 years ago was a tariff act, and that act has remained in effect in one form or another ever since the establishment of our Government. That is a subsidy, nothing more and nothing less. It has cost our people up to \$4,000,000,000 a year. There are many other subsidies that could be mentioned. I merely mention this to advise you that I do not consider the question a new one at all; it is just as old as the Government itself. The charge of being new is used to try to keep the farmers from getting the benefit of subsidies.

OPONENTS NOT AGAINST ALL SUBSIDIES

The Members of this House who are attempting to deny the farmers of this country the benefit of a fair price by denying to them the benefit of subsidies do not oppose all subsidies, they only oppose some subsidies; and I state again that for anyone to campaign on an issue against a subsidy and say it is fundamentally wrong, that the Treasury should not use this money for the purpose of paying subsidies and then at the same time say: "I am for certain subsidies" which of course are just as fundamentally wrong, is bordering upon the hypocritical, and is certainly inconsistent.

ONE HUNDRED BILLION ALREADY SAVED ON COST OF WAR

The cost of our war to date would have been almost \$100,000,000,000 more and our national debt would have been increased by that amount had not price control been as effective as it has been and had not subsidies been used to keep down the cost of items that go into our war machinery. I again repeat to you an outstanding case where subsidies have been used to great advantage. I could give you many. During World War No. 1 prices went out the roof. The gentleman who just preceded me is advocating a return to the policies of World War No. 1. Anyone who reads that record will be convinced very quickly that it would not be in the public interest to return to the price policies of World War No. 1.

PRICE POLICIES OF WORLD WAR NO. 1 BAD

In the first place, we paid 30 cents a pound for sugar instead of less than 7 cents a pound as the price is today. The price of sugar has not increased 1 penny in this war. Furthermore, we paid more than 90 cents a pound for coffee during the First World War, while we are paying less than 30 cents a pound today in this war. I could enumerate a number of things that increased from 3 to 10 times as much under the policies of World War No. 1 as they have increased under the price policies and laws of World War No. 2. So just a casual glance at the figures will convince anyone that only a person who is willing to tolerate ruinous inflation, runaway prices, unbridled inflation, and an extremely high cost of living could afford to advocate such policies as we had in World War No. 1. In this war we have endeavored to profit by the experiences of the past, which is as it should be.

FIRST PRICE CONTROL ACT

In January 1942, we passed a law known as the First Price Control Act, the hearings having commenced on that bill in August preceding its final enactment in January 1942. Congress made a mistake then by not having prices fixed for everything, wages, salaries, commodities, and everything else, but we were led to believe that we should not do that, that if we would give the Price Administrator the power to slap a price ceiling on anything that looked like it was going to get out of line it would be sufficient power for him to have to keep these prices under control. It was a beautiful theory and we passed the bill that way. We were mistaken and it did not work, so very soon thereafter the President of the United States came out with a message to Congress stating that the Congress should pass a price-control act that would place a price ceiling on not only prices but also wages and salaries and specified by using the phrase, "Items that affect the cost of living."

SECOND PRICE CONTROL ACT—PRESIDENT DIRECTED BY CONGRESS

So the Congress passed the Second Price Control Act, dated October 2, 1942. That Second Price Control Act not only authorized the President of the United States but it directed him.

That is one case where the Congress has used a directive on the Chief Executive of our Nation. The President is directed under the October 2, 1942, act to fix all prices, wages and salaries and items that go into the cost of living on the basis of prices existing on September 15, 1942 insofar as practicable and we only permit him under the act to deviate from that where he finds it is necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities.

CONGRESS DIRECTS PRESIDENT TO HOLD LINE AS OF SEPTEMBER 15, 1942

In other words, the legislative body has directed the Chief Executive to hold that line as of September 15, 1942. The labor groups claim he has held that line very much to their detriment. They insist that the cost of living has gone up sufficiently so that they should not only have the benefit of the so-called Little Steel formula of a 15-percent increase but they should have an increase that is in excess of that 15 percent.

WILL WE FIX THIRD LINE FOR PRESIDENT TO HOLD?

The point is whether we will fix another line to hold. The First Price Control Act fixed the line as the prices prevailing between October 1 and October 15, 1941. That was the first line we were expecting to hold and we failed to hold it. Then we came back and we directed the President to hold the line as of September 15, 1942, and he has been attempting to hold it. So the question is, Will we go back and repeal that directive and will we fix another line to try to hold? Or will we destroy the line and have no line at all to attempt to hold? If so, how many more lines are we going to establish and when are we going to hold the line? That is the point.

INFLATION SERIOUS NOW—A FIGHT IS NOW BEING WAGED TO INCREASE THE COST OF LIVING

The question of inflation is more serious today than it has ever been in the history of the American Government. You see here an effort on the part of our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle to increase the cost of living. That is what it is. You are making a fight to increase the cost of living. That is your fight. Whether you are willing to admit it or not, that is what you are driving at. You are trying to increase the cost of living and destroy the only guide we have to hold prices. When you increase the cost of living, obviously wages and salaries must be increased too. You are not holding the line. Then when you increase wages and salaries, that causes the cost of production to go up, so you will have to increase prices again. And when you increase prices again you have got to come back and increase wages and salaries again. So it becomes a race between prices on the one side and wages and salaries on the other. That is what you are advocating.

INFLATION ADVOCATED

You are advocating a race, you are advocating inflation, you are advocating increasing the cost of living, that is what you are advocating, and when you have this race between prices and wages, prices and wages will go out the roof—

the same effect you can get from mercury by putting a lighted match under the thermometer. The mercury will go out the top. That is what will happen to prices.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Unfortunately I missed the first part of the gentleman's talk. I just wonder if the gentleman has commented upon the increased cost of the war if we do have this inflationary spiral inasmuch as the Government purchases a large part of the food and also the materials of war.

REPUBLICANS ADVOCATING AN INCREASE IN THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. PATMAN. I have not expanded upon that, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am talking frankly. I have no dislike for a person who is not a member of the party that I happen to be affiliated with. Some of my very best friends are members of the other party and some of the most able men in the House are members of the other party. This is not a party issue with me. We are in a war and we have to win this war. We have to also succeed on the second front, which is to stop inflation. Inflation is almost as bad as losing the war. So we have a real fight here at home. I cannot understand why our Republican friends keep advocating increasing the cost of living and increasing the cost of everything.

NO ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTED

Maybe subsidies is not the right way to do it, maybe that is not the right way to hold it down. Let us say for the sake of argument it is not, that we should use some other method. What method are you going to use? Will you please suggest it? How are you going to keep the cost of living down without subsidies? I would like to know. If there is another way just as good I would be for it, but our Republican friends place themselves in the position of advocating an increase in the cost of living as against subsidies, and offer no alternative. They just want to increase the cost of living. I cannot understand why they want inflation.

FIRST CROP OF WORLD WAR NO. 2 MILLIONAIRES

Further, something else I cannot understand about our friend is this. The President asked for a \$15,000,000,000 tax bill. Instead of giving him a \$15,000,000,000 tax bill, a solid front on the part of our Republican friends forced through what was known as the Ruml plan, or 75 percent of it, which, instead of taking taxes away from the people, actually gave back to the people \$7,500,000,000, going in the other direction, causing inflation.

Incidentally, that was the first crop of war millionaires made in this war, made by legislative action, a congressional crop of war millionaires. The Ruml plan just gave back \$7,500,000,000, much of it to war millionaires. Now they say not only do they want to give that money away but they do not want to put any more taxes on them. They are against taxes. They want to give money away. They are for an increased cost of living.

Where is this country going, if you adopt a policy like that?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say with reference to the last remark of the gentleman that I agree with him thoroughly that we made a great mistake when we forgave \$7,000,000,000 on war profits made in 1942. Congress certainly legislated a crop of war millionaires in that Ruml plan and paved the way for heavier unjust taxes.

But that is not why I rose to question the gentleman. I, too, came in in the midst of the gentleman's remarks. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to make some comparison between the increased cost of living in this war and in the First World War?

Mr. PATMAN. I did not today, but, if the gentleman will take the Record of yesterday and look on page 8777, he will find a statement that compares the cost of different principal items in this war with the cost in the last war. They are contained in a statement presented by Mr. Prentiss Brown when he resigned as Price Administrator recently.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say to the gentleman that I think that in spite of all the fault we are finding with our attempts to hold the line we have actually held the line this time to a certain extent, and to a remarkable extent, so that the increased cost of living due to this war is nothing in comparison with that of the preceding war. Our great middle class would already have been destroyed under the operation of so-called natural law, if we had not done what has been done.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is exactly right. Even though we feel that we are entitled to more money, we are not getting enough rent on our property, or we should have higher wages, but we should remember this, that it is better to get money that is worth something, that will buy something, and be worth nearly 100 cents on the dollar than to have this race between wages and prices, with money eventually not being worth very much of anything.

WIPE OUT MIDDLE CLASS

The best way on earth to wipe out the middle class in this country is to increase the cost of living, as advocated by our Republican friends. In other words, they are advocating wiping out the middle class. There will be two classes, then, the very poor and the very rich. Only the very rich can survive inflation.

Mr. MURDOCK. At the present time the items which have increased in cost are few, relatively, whereas in the First World War, the items that increased in cost were almost 100 percent. I recall distinctly at the time of the other World War, and no doubt the gentlemen about me will also remember it personally, that practically every item of consumption increased in cost, most of them as much as 300 percent. There was one item nationally advertised in those days, and it was said that postage stamps and this

particular well-known food item were the only two purchasable things which had not increased in price. The manufacturer then made that claim in high-class magazine advertisements. At least, that cannot be said now.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice that in this war, even after remitting much of it to the war profiteers—\$7,500,000,000—they are proposing to increase even the postage rate 25 percent. Even the postage stamp will not get by; they will increase the postage rate by 25 percent. The recipient of an old-age pension will have to pay 25 percent to inquire why his check has not arrived.

IN WARTIME

I know in wartime you have to be for many things you do not like. In a legislative body we oftentimes have to vote for something and accept something bad in order to keep from having to take something that is worse. That is the way legislative processes are. We have to give and take. We cannot have legislation unless we do give and take. A Member of Congress, of either the House or the Senate, who stands up and says, "These are my convictions. I am not going to yield. As a matter of right and justice I know that I should not yield, therefore I will not yield anything," never accomplishes anything. He just keeps his views and convictions, and that is all he has. He never gets anything done. Every major law that is passed by the Congress represents a compromise of view or a sacrifice of opinion on the part of practically every Member of these two bodies. We have to give and take. In time of war that is especially true.

I do not like taxes and I do not like to vote for them, but sometimes we have to take something bad, as I said, to keep from taking something worse. It is better to have taxes and preserve our country and protect it from inflation than not to have taxes and have our country destroyed by inflation. So the alternative is sometimes so bad that we are compelled to take something we do not like.

POPULAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS

I guess the most popular Member of Congress would be one who could take this attitude. A constituent could say, "I don't like that tax bill." The Member would say, "Well, I voted against it. I voted against all tax bills." The constituent could say, "I sure do like the money you gave us for this college over here or this soil-conservation project. I like that." The Member could say, "Well, I voted for that."

In other words, to vote for all appropriations and against all tax bills is a fine way for a Member of Congress to stand pretty well before his constituents, but it does not protect the country. It does not save the country.

We must look beyond just this temporary period, we must look into the future and we must guard against the things that might happen in the future.

On the tax question especially I should like to say something. I think we are making an awful mistake. I am going to say something that is very unpopular. It is very unpopular to say what I have been saying about the O. P. A., I know

that. No one has to tell me that, but I believe it is in the public interest.

NOT TAXING ENOUGH

There is another thing that is really unpopular that I want to say, and that is we are not taxing enough. I do not know where the money should come from, but it should come from somewhere. We are paying about one-third of the cost of this war as we go along, while Great Britain and Canada are paying 50 percent, or near 55 percent. We are not paying enough of the cost of this war as we go along. We are borrowing too much on long-term bonds. There is the interest that will have to be paid, and the result will be that by the time these bonds are paid, we will be paying \$1 and \$2 interest on every dollar that we have borrowed. Whereas, if we tax now and pay the money now, it will not only help us by \$1 on the war debt but the equivalent of \$2 and \$3. Therefore we should pay every dollar we can as we go along.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I notice in the newspaper this morning a release from the Treasury Department in which it is said that the people of this country, under the present tax plan, will pay more taxes than the people in England and Canada.

Mr. PATMAN. That was a very artful statement. I do not know anything about it. I merely saw the headline in the paper. I did not have time to read it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is per capita.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, well, of course, figures do not lie, but sometimes liars figure; and I am not calling the gentleman a liar; neither am I denouncing the author of the figures. I am only explaining the process.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That article had reference to the per capita payment and it did not compare income.

Mr. PATMAN. They are doing just one thing here, and they added to the crop of millionaires by not making them pay 25 percent last year. Add not only the present taxes, but 25-percent taxes due from last year, and you make this per capita high, and I make this statement, and I challenge anyone to successfully contradict it. If you take the 2 years, 1942 and 1943, and you consider the taxes paid in the United States and the taxes paid in Canada and in England, you will find that the income-tax payers in England and in Canada pay 300 percent more than we do in the United States for these 2 years. But through the use of trick figures anyone will be able to show that the per capita for 1 year is quite different, and obviously that is what they are trying to show. They overlook the juggling around that they are going through in getting those figures. There is another reason why we should pay more of the cost of this war as we go along.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. I was wondering if the gentleman understands that the

trick figures he refers to are the official release that comes from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know whose they are.

Mr. GEARHART. It is Mr. Randolph Paul.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know anything about them except what has been said here.

Mr. GEARHART. He is the chief counsel of the Treasury Department.

Mr. PATMAN. I say this, and I challenge Mr. Paul or any other person to contradict it, that if you take what you pay in taxes for 2 years, you will find that in Canada and in England they are paying 300 percent more than we are paying in the United States—for the 2 years 1942 and 1943 that is—the same class of taxpayers, or the average, and that statement cannot be successfully challenged or contradicted.

There is another reason why we should pay more taxes and that is to syphon off the excess purchasing power. Many people here are saying, why do we have so many people working for the O. P. A., while in Canada they have only a few and in England they have only a few and here we have several thousand. The problems are different. England and Canada have such high taxes, they syphon off so much of that excess purchasing power, that the people do not have the money with which to go into the competitive markets and compete with one another, as we do here for various articles. Therefore, the problem is a difficult one here and not difficult over there. So, in order to keep down inflation, we should syphon off more of the excess purchasing power through taxes, and pay it on this war debt, because every dollar we pay now saves us two or three dollars that would have to be paid in the future, much of it to be paid by our returning servicemen, who are fighting to save us and our country on the 55 battle fronts of the world.

I am reminded of subsidies again by a gentleman near me. Let us take copper, for instance. We are paying out on copper, lead, zinc, about \$80,000,000 in subsidies. We had two alternatives. We wanted more copper production. The Anaconda and the Phelps-Dodge are the two No. 1 copper producers, and they were making plenty of money at 12 cents a pound. We wanted more copper. There are other mines that could be operated, but we would have to pay them 15 cents or 17 cents or 23 cents or 34 cents a pound, and so the question was, Why increase the price of copper to 35 cents in order to bring in these high-price mines? So what did we do? We kept the price at 12 cents a pound on the present high-grade mines that were receiving 12 cents a pound, and we paid a subsidy of 5 or 10 or 15 cents a pound in order to get production in the other mines. We increased production 10 percent and that is the limit, and we saved the high price on 90 percent of the copper. It was successful. You are advocating just the opposite of that. Now, by paying less than \$80,000,000 a year on copper, we are saving the taxpayers a billion dollars a

year. Is not that good business? Is not that good sense?

It can be used in the same way with a lot of other commodities. All of them, it cannot; I will admit that. But, why restrict it? Why not leave it to somebody to say "Pick out the commodities where they can be used successfully and save the taxpayers money but do not use it where it cannot be used successfully?"

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would the gentleman please take butter for his example—butter and milk, because that is much more widely used than copper. There is a subsidy being paid on it and production is falling daily.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. Let us take milk now. I know the gentleman made some reference to one gentleman who spoke on this who was not a farmer, but what he said about that is perfectly all right. It happens in this case I was a farmer, and at one time Congressman Marvin Jones, of Texas, and I were the only two Members of this House who at one time had been tenant farmers, who had actually worked on a farm; plowed and hoed, and picked cotton and everything else. So, I was a tenant farmer and I know something about farming. I know it from the standpoint of the farmer. And I will be very glad to endeavor to answer the gentleman's question about milk.

MUST TAKE CARE OF FARMER

Now, milk is one of the most important food items. Food is just as important as bullets. Unless you have enough food you cannot win any war. Suppose you only had 90 percent enough bullets in a battle, you would lose the battle just the same. If you have only 90 percent enough food you will likely lose the battle. So we have to encourage production and must not run any risk of having too little food. There are two ways of doing it. One way is to increase the price; get into a race with wages and salaries and cause inflation, which we are all bound to admit, because it increases the cost of living. The other way is to take care of the farmer, who works harder than any other person I know for the money he receives, and under the most adverse and hardship conditions of any person who works. We have to take care of him and encourage him to produce food. So instead of increasing the cost of living and instead of breaking through that line which the Congress has directed the President to hold, there is only one other way we can do it, and that is to tell that farmer: "Now, your labor has increased; your food bill has increased; your other items of expenses have increased and you cannot sell this milk for the price we have fixed on it. So we will make up that difference in a subsidy so as to encourage you to produce." What difference does it make to the farmer if he receives the price he wants, part of it from the Treasury of the United States and part of it from the one to whom he sells, or whether he receives it all from the Treasury or all from the one to whom he sells? It makes

no difference on earth. You are not going to have production unless you take care of that farmer.

Now, under this bill which we are all talking about, whether we name it or not, subsidies will end at the close of this year. All support prices will end. Of all the things that the farmer wants, the one thing he wants more than anything else is to know how much he is going to get for what he raises. We have been able to give him support prices in the past, but under this bill that is brought out you cannot give him any more support prices. Support prices will work to encourage production. Potatoes are a fine example.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield right there? I think the gentleman should be corrected.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; if I am wrong I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman reads the bill carefully he will find section 3, in which there is a direction that they will continue to issue support prices, and they will continue to make loans under the so-called Steagall bill. I know the gentleman does not want to be inaccurate.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is bringing up something that was not contended in the committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What he means is that the support prices which I announced will stop because they have been using the power to announce support prices in order to effectuate the consumers' subsidies. Then the bill goes on to say that they will continue to announce support prices. It directs them to continue to announce support prices.

Mr. PATMAN. I know what the bill provides. Of course, the gentleman knows. I was in there when the bill was written. The gentleman was there when the bill was written. In fact, it is his amendment. You know he is the author of this high-cost-of-living amendment. The amendment says, if I can read the English language, that all support prices and all subsidies that were authorized before October 13 may go on until December 31. That is all. So they all end December 31.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield. Now the gentleman is bringing up something that was not contended in the committee. I never heard it mentioned before. It is a new theory and a new definition and a new interpretation entirely.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. When the gentleman revises his remarks this evening will he add to them, following the language which he has just quoted, the very next sentence in that section?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; you know that section 3 is one of the most cleverly written sections that I have ever read. I give the gentleman credit. He is very clever. I presume I should change my statement about no support prices at all to no satisfactory support prices. The prices that will be authorized as support prices un-

der the amendment will be too low to obtain production and therefore the same as no support prices at all. I will insert a comment by Judge Marvin Jones that will bear out the point I am making.

The gentleman from Michigan for the minority Members starts out in the amendment by saying that a subsidy is one of the worst things on earth—a subsidy. No one in the world ought to have to pay anybody else's grocery bill. It is all right to help pay your fuel bill, your rent bill, but it is all wrong to help pay anybody's grocery bill. He is against all kinds of subsidies—provided, however—I wonder why he put it in there—

Provided, however, That this shall not apply to vegetable oils and fats, and oil seeds.

And I should like to ask the gentleman now how he can justify advocating the payment of a subsidy on oleomargarine to benefit one producing oleomargarine, but will not permit it to benefit the man who produces butter.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman can imagine oleomargarine being used as a lubricant of munitions of warfare, he is correct in his premise.

Mr. PATMAN. But this is "vegetable oils and fats and oil seeds" whether you eat them or whether you use them on machinery. That is the first time I ever heard of oleo being used for lubrication of machinery.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me answer the gentleman's question. We exempted vegetable fats and oils and oil seeds because that is vegetable oil used in the lubrication of the machinery of war.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, butter may be used the same way. You did not exempt butter.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If oleomargarine is used as a lubricant of machinery of war, then the gentleman is correct in his premise.

Mr. PATMAN. Why did not the gentleman exempt other fats and oils if used for that purpose?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, there is no restrictive language in that section 3 to those fats and oils that are used as lubricants; it is all-inclusive.

Mr. PATMAN. That is all.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman from Texas is entirely correct when he says that you can subsidize oleomargarine under the bill as it is presently written but you cannot subsidize butter.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished ranking member on the minority side pointed out the mandatory loan provision of the Steagall bill. I am certain the gentleman from Michigan knows that those loans are only 90 percent of parity and that every single essential item necessary to encourage war production of foods is above the 90 percent of parity level. It is a foolish gesture to the farmer therefore to say that this 90 percent mandatory loan provision of the

Steagall bill protects them at this time in their prices.

Mr. PATMAN. It does not. In other words, this principle that is announced here will be antagonistic to what we have done for the farmers.

PAY MORE COST OF WAR

There is one other thing I want to say: We should pay more of the cost of this war as we go along. We should pay it now, because \$1 paid now will equal two or three dollars in the future and also will help keep down inflation. Furthermore it will be in fairness to the men who are winning this war upon the battlefields of the world. It is absolutely wrong for us to sit here and pay no more of the cost of this war and then let the men, the millions of them, go forth to the battle fronts of the world, bare their breasts to the enemy's bullets and come back here injured and maimed, some of them, and have to bear not only the cost of the war but compound interest on it doubled and trebled after they get back. It is absolutely wrong, and for that reason I am respectfully suggesting to my friends that they consider requiring us all to pay more of the cost of the war as we go.

I cannot understand the logic of my friend from Michigan. He brings up a point of view I never heard of before; I never heard it; it is something entirely new to me. He says nothing about it, I never heard him say anything about it, never heard him make any statement about it until he brings it up by just reaching out and clutching it out of the thin air. There is something I cannot understand. My friend is in favor of copper subsidies; he is in favor of lead subsidies; he is in favor of zinc subsidies; he is in favor of rent subsidies, public housing; he is in favor of helping pay the fuel bill of the people in New England through this subsidy on transportation of oil; he is in favor of a subsidy to cottonseed producers and soybean producers, and peanut producers, but he is against a food subsidy.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does not the gentleman from Texas believe that the gentleman from Michigan is competent to speak for himself as to what he is in favor of?

Mr. PATMAN. He certainly is; and he is one of the most alert and able Members of this body. That is the reason I cannot understand why he would get in that inconsistent position; I just cannot understand it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I hope the gentleman from Texas will be tolerant enough to allow me in the future to state what I am in favor of.

Mr. PATMAN. The only reason I am mentioning these things now is because I have not been on the committee with the gentleman for years and years and years, and heard him express himself and answer these questions without knowing his views. Now, if I have misquoted him in any way, I yield to him

now to correct me. Is not the gentleman in favor of all these subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish the gentleman would not quote me categorically.

Mr. PATMAN. I ask the gentleman, Do I misquote you? If I do, wherein did I misquote you?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman quoted me as being in favor of certain subsidies. I can sum it all up, if the gentleman wants to know my stand.

Mr. PATMAN. I will not yield to the gentleman for a speech. I am not yielding, Mr. Speaker, for a speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman will not yield?

Mr. PATMAN. If I made an error, I will yield to him for a correction of that error.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Although the gentleman asked me a question? Does he want to yield to me further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield if I made a mistake for the gentleman to correct it, because I do not want any mistake going into this RECORD, but I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman yield for a statement after he has seen fit to quote me categorically? He does not yield to me for a statement?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a correction and I apologize to the gentleman if I have misquoted him. I do not believe the gentleman will say I misquoted him.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can make a statement in one sentence which will correct all the inaccuracies which the gentleman has stated.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield further.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I said the gentleman favored the copper subsidy, the lead subsidy, the zinc subsidy, the rent subsidy—

Mr. WOLCOTT. Wait a minute right there.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Where have you ever heard me say that I favored the rent subsidy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORRELL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman states I misquoted him on one, and I correct that. He does not deny he is for a lead subsidy, a zinc subsidy, a copper subsidy, and a fuel subsidy, but he said he is not for a rent subsidy. I will say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] says he is not for a rent subsidy.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will speak for myself in that respect.

Mr. PATMAN. What is that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. My objection is that the gentleman is attempting to speak for me. I will speak for myself on those things.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman says I have misquoted him, I yield for a correction, but I am not yielding for anything else.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will correct the gentleman then if he will yield to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Not for a speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not think the gentleman—

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, then I make the point of order a quorum is not present. He is not going to say these things about me.

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield for a correction if I have made an error.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to him to correct any errors that I have made.

Mr. WOLCOTT. My principal objection, if the gentleman from Texas will bear with me—

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I object to his quoting me as being in favor of something, or being against something, when it is not based upon facts or anything which I have ever said or that the gentleman has ever heard me say.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman heard what I said. He is not denying it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order temporarily.

Mr. PATMAN. He is not denying it, and he will not deny it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it means denying it, I will deny it; and I wish the gentleman in his remarks from now on would quote himself. He knows what he believes, I know what I believe, and let me speak for myself.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is able to take care of himself.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I am.

Mr. PATMAN. I will say, too, that the gentleman not only favored copper and the lead and the zinc and the housing subsidies—he has some question about housing, so I withdraw that—but he is in favor of a subsidy on peanuts, a subsidy on cottonseed, a subsidy on oil seed, soybeans, and all those things. So how can a man consistently say he is against all subsidies if he favors those subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me for an answer?

Mr. PATMAN. And he expresses the sentiment of the Members on that side of the aisle.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me for an answer?

Mr. PATMAN. He is the head man, and he is a good one. He is the head man on the minority side of the Banking and Currency Committee, and they all vote exactly with him on this question. I only refer to him because he represents the Members of the minority party on this question. Nothing personal is intended.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield for the answer to that question?

Mr. PATMAN. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Speaking only for myself but not anybody else, and I am glad of the compliment the gentleman has paid me and, of course, I appreciate it, I have never been against any subsidy being paid by any agency of the Government for the purpose of obtaining the maximum amount of production, whether it had to do with strategic or critical materials or food.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer that. How can the gentleman consistently say that when he is opposing a subsidy on dairy products? We can have plenty of production if they could pay the right kind of a subsidy and at the same time keep down the cost of living.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Texas keeps slipping back into copper and lead and zinc and a lot of other things. I am trying to keep the gentleman on the subject he started on, and that was milk and dairy products.

Mr. PATMAN. I thought I convinced the gentleman that was the only way to do it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman's theory is correct—and I respect the gentleman's statement—why is it that the production then is falling?

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the gentleman this: Does he know any other way to encourage the production of dairy products and farm products without increasing the cost of living?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is yes.

Mr. PATMAN. All right; what is it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is that we shall set a price for production, and we shall cut out the present method of giving the handlers more than they ever had in peacetimes and more than they expect today.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is not answering my question.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And not increase the cost to the consumer.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me ask the gentleman if he knows of any way to keep down the cost of living. The plan the gentleman is advocating would mean an increase in the cost of living.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is not correct.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman wants to advocate an increase in the cost of living, that is for him, it is not for me. He has a perfect right to do it. He is responsible to his people, and I am responsible to mine. I have no right to criticize him and he has no right to criticize me. But I have time and again challenged the Members on the other side of the aisle to name a way except subsidies to cut down the cost of living and at the same time encourage production of needed foods.

The Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on September 29, 1943, on the bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation. In his testimony he outlined what his policy would be on the subsidy program as well as other policies. His statement was as follows:

In appearing before this committee today in connection with the bill to continue the

Commodity Credit Corporation and to increase its borrowing capacity by \$500,000,000, I want to point out at the outset that 1944 is to be an all-out food-production year. All of our thinking must come back to that.

It won't be easy for farmers to reach the high production goals in 1944 with the planned acreage of 380,000,000 acres—16,000,000 acres more even than this year. We must give farmers every financial and physical aid in their effort to produce the largest possible volume of food.

I hope that it won't ever be necessary to draw on the full borrowing capacity of the Corporation for crop loans and price supports. But at the same time, in order to assure production we must be in a position to make good our guaranties to farmers of prices that are necessary to see them through the growing, harvesting, and marketing seasons.

You, of course, are familiar with the effort to stabilize consumer prices. We are also committed to a policy of getting a larger production of food this year than last. This may make necessary some additional support prices.

For 1944 we expect the volume of production to be greater—we hope considerably greater. Farmers' costs will be higher than this year, and so farmer returns will need to be somewhat more.

I believe we should have the authority to make whatever price guaranties may be necessary to get an all-out agricultural production in 1944.

I have stated repeatedly that in the development of the food program we shall put the main reliance upon the farmers themselves, and thus build up the program from the grass roots. It is my intention to continue to consult Members of Congress from time to time as to these programs.

While we are in this meeting today, the farmers all over the country—at every crossroads and in every county—are trying to figure out the best way to increase their 1944 production. We want to help them in every practical way.

We expect that costs of production will not rise as much during this coming year as they have risen during the first 2 or 3 years of the war. But they may rise some. In order to increase production, we want to be able to meet that rise in our farm price supports.

I know that the Nation's farmers and ranchmen will produce an abundance if they have the necessary tools, equipment, and repairs, fertilizer, credit, labor, and a price that is adequate to cover the extra costs and hazards of increased production. We shall continue to drive for every possible physical and financial aid to production.

In my judgment, the best way to get production is to have a definite support price that will last throughout the season. It should be high enough to cover the added risks and hazards that go with increased production and it should be announced early. This means that the Government would stand ready to buy any surplus of a commodity that might not flow into the regular channels at the time, and to absorb whatever loss may be necessary.

As I have indicated, the bulk of the borrowing capacity which is proposed in the present bill will be used in commitments to support prices to farmers at not less than 85 to 90 percent of parity, as we are directed to do by Congress. Even though we don't lend up to the full amount of these commitments, we must stand ready to make good at all times to see the farmers through in return for the great effort they are making to meet all of our food requirements—to keep our boys at the front well fed and our war workers and other civilians at home in the best possible physical condition to produce the guns, the planes, the ships, and other munitions of war.

I want to bring one specific point to the attention of the committee. Under the present law, the Commodity Credit Corporation

cannot sell any commodity except grain for feeding at less than the parity price. Such a provision appears reasonable for commodities that can be stored. However, we are announcing some price supports for perishable commodities. In the case of perishable commodities the Corporation should be permitted to dispose of such commodities at less than parity where necessary to prevent waste of food.

I am also attaching herewith a statement prepared by the War Food Administration relative to the effect of section 3 of the proposed bill and also the program on certain commodities for 1943. It is as follows:

Except for competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseeds, and the right under section 4 of H. R. 3477 for Commodity Credit Corporation to sell perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of substantial loss due to spoilage, section 3 would prohibit Commodity Credit Corporation, or any other Government agency, from making any payments or absorbing any losses for the purpose of reducing or maintaining, or in lieu of increasing, ceiling prices on agricultural commodities or commodities processed in whole or substantial part therefrom. The provisions of this section would compel ceiling prices on such commodities to reflect to producers a price not less than the highest of the following: The support price, the comparable or parity price, or the highest average price received by producers from January 1, 1942, to September 15, 1942.

The probable effect, by commodities, of the provisions of this section on price ceilings and price-supporting activities of Commodity Credit Corporation and other Government agencies would be as follows:

1. Increases in maximum prices.

(a) Such increases as might be necessary in the ceiling price of pork products to reflect not less than \$13.75 per hundredweight at Chicago for good to choice butcher hogs of weights from 200 to 270 pounds.

(b) An increase of 5 cents per pound in the ceiling price of butter.

(c) An increase of approximately 4 cents per pound in the ceiling price of American cheddar cheese.

(d) Increases of as much as \$1.20 per hundredweight on some varieties of dry edible beans and lesser increases for other varieties.

(e) Such increases in the prices of canned corn, tomatoes, green beans and peas, as would be necessary to reflect increases of 25 to 50 percent in the cost of the raw materials and certain approved increases in labor costs.

(f) Increases of about \$45 per ton in the ceiling prices for prunes and raisins.

(g) Increase of at least one-half cent per pound in the ceiling price of sugar in order to reflect the present support price of sugar beets. This increase would apply to all sugar although domestic sugar beets supply only one-fourth to one-fifth of the sugar consumed in the United States.

2. Discontinuation of the support price payment operations being carried out with respect to dry edible beans, canning crops, cheese, prunes, raisins, sugar beets, sugarcane, butter, beef, pork, hay for feeding dairy cattle in the drought areas of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and North Carolina, and sales of wheat for feed at less than the cost of such wheat.

3. Since specific support prices have not been announced with respect to beef cattle, the provisions of section 3 would not make it mandatory that ceiling prices on meat products be increased, but if such ceiling prices were not increased, prices to producers probably would be reduced by the amount of the present payments that are being made with respect to beef. A similar situation would prevail with respect to hogs to the ex-

tent that the present payments make it possible for packers to pay more than the support price.

The ultimate cost to the Government of stopping these programs would be several times greater than the losses now being incurred. At the same time, many price ceilings would be more difficult to enforce.

Section 3 would definitely tie support prices to ceiling prices. This would mean that by or before January 1, 1944, in all cases in which price supports are above ceiling prices the ceiling prices would be increased to the support-price level. In connection with support prices for 1944 such prices could not in any case be above the new ceiling price. The practical effect of this would be to freeze support prices at present levels which in many cases would mean substantially less production in 1944.

Estimated losses resulting from price-support commitments and operations due to increased costs are as follows:

Program	Period covered	Estimated loss (in millions)
Commodity Credit Corporation:		
Dry beans.....	1943 crop.....	\$8
Potatoes.....	do.....	20
Prunes.....	do.....	7
Raisins.....	do.....	7
Canning vegetables.....	do.....	30
Sugar.....	do.....	50
Cheddar cheese.....	1943.....	25
Fluid milk.....	1943.....	5
Oilseeds and products.....	1943 crops.....	60
Feed wheat.....	Fiscal year 1944.....	70
Dairy feed payments.....	1943.....	60
Miscellaneous.....	1943.....	8
Total.....		350
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Meat and butter.....	June to December 1943.....	200

Section 3 of H. R. 3477 provides that support prices can be continued but any maximum price hereafter established shall not be below the support price therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729 approved October 2, 1942.

In order to refresh the memory of the Members of the House as to just what section 3 is, the section that will stop subsidies after December 31, 1943, and stop support prices except as authorized, which will be unsatisfactory, I am inserting it herewith. It is as follows:

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which subsidy programs or support prices have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out and such support prices may continue to be maintained to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but not beyond December 31, 1943: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public

Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729; approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS ON SECTION 3

At my request the War Food Administrator, the Honorable Marvin Jones, commented upon this section for my information. His letter is inserted herewith. It will be noticed that Mr. Jones states in one part of his explanation:

This will involve some subsidies, but they are subsidies that are established primarily for the purpose of securing production, and the expenditures will be much less, both on the part of the Government and on the part of the public, than if the stabilization line were broken.

The entire letter is as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 21, 1943.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR WRIGHT: In response to your request, I am enclosing a statement prepared in the War Food Administration showing the probable effect by commodities of the provisions of section 3 of the proposed commodity credit bill, should it be adopted in its present form. I believe this analysis is substantially correct and is as accurate an estimate as can be made at this time.

The Commodity Credit Corporation already is in operation support prices on a number of different commodities. These were instituted in order to maintain the present ceiling prices and at the same time secure the necessary war food production. They will involve a loss of approximately \$350,000,000 for the year 1943. A table showing the losses in the food program for 1943 is hereto attached.

We have included in both the attached analysis and the table R. F. C. losses for 1943 (as estimated by that agency), since the proposed bill as now worded would affect that agency.

To adopt the bill in its present form would require one of two things:

1. The lifting of all ceiling prices to support price levels, both those now prevailing and any that may be established in the future. This would jeopardize the entire stabilization program.

2. The other and more probable effect would be to reduce all support prices to present ceiling prices. This would materially hamper production.

It seems to me that it would be wise to permit the continuation of the present program of the War Food Administration and to leave no stone unturned in our efforts to produce the necessary food for the coming year. This will involve some subsidies, but they are subsidies that are established primarily for the purpose of securing production, and the expenditures will be much less, both on the part of the Government and on the part of the public, than if the stabilization line were broken.

If section 3, in its present form, is included in the bill, it will practically destroy the support price program. Carrying forward the support price program will involve some losses. This, however, would apply only to the commodities where the support price must be above the level of ceiling prices if we are to secure the necessary war food production.

The support price program for this year has involved the loss of only about \$350,000,000. It has resulted in tremendous production. We will need even greater production in the coming year. The adoption of the bill would force a complete change, embark us on a course of great uncertainty, and jeopardize beyond measure our prospective 1944 production, which is vital to the war effort. This program has not only enabled us to realize these goals but to secure production in excess of the goals that were established.

We would like to suggest one of three courses in connection with this measure:

1. Strike out all of section 3. This would still leave the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities limited by the provision in the Agriculture Appropriation Act which forbids the selling of Government owned or controlled commodities below parity, with certain exceptions named in that provision.

2. If the Congress decides to retain section 3, we feel that it would be wise if an amendment were attached which would permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to use not exceeding \$600,000,000 for the year 1944, along the lines of our present price support program. The clause respecting any other agency should be eliminated, since such questions should be determined when that agency is before the committee.

3. If it is decided to retain section 3 without any provision as to funds, we suggest the amendment set out in draft B, attached hereto. This latter would have the effect of permitting the continuation of a program along similar lines to that now being maintained, subject to the limitations set out in the Agriculture Appropriation Act.

We feel that the language as reported by the committee in section 3 would completely tie the hands of the War Food Administration and that section 3 should either be completely eliminated or modified somewhat along the lines suggested in the proposed amendments.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

THE GROUPS SECTION 3 WILL FURTHER DEPRESS
BY INCREASING THEIR COST OF LIVING

The proposal to include section 3 in H. R. 3477 is nothing more or less than a proposal to increase the cost of living. There is no other way that I know of that will permit the President to hold the line on prices, wages, and salaries except through the use of subsidies. Our opponents have been challenged repeatedly to suggest an alternative, but they cannot suggest one. Therefore, they are in effect openly advocating an increase in the cost of living and, indirectly, runaway inflation. I am inserting herewith a table showing the number of people who are receiving fixed incomes of different types and who will be quickly and very seriously affected by any cost-of-living increase. It is as follows:

Recipients of fixed incomes, by type of payment¹

	Number of recipients (millions) ²
A. Public assistance.....	2.94
1. Old-age assistance.....	2.17
2. Aid to dependent children.....	.31
3. Aid to the blind.....	.08
4. General relief.....	.38

Footnotes at end of table.

B. Government salaries.....	4.58
1. Federal (excluding military) ⁴	1.34

2. State and local (excluding public education).....	1.92
3. Public education.....	1.32
C. Military allotments ³	4.75
D. Veterans' pensions.....	.86
E. Old-age and survivors' insurance.....	.69
1. Lump-sum payments.....	.01
2. Monthly payments ³68
F. Railroad retirement ⁴16
G. Civil-service pensions ³07
Total.....	14.05

¹Excluding interest, rents, and military pay; exclusive also of life-insurance payments, which are not available.

²Only recipients are indicated. Reliable data on the total number of persons dependent upon fixed incomes (i. e., recipients and their dependents) are not available. It may be estimated by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor that approximately 6,000,000 workers are currently receiving wages of less than 40 cents an hour.

³May 1943.

⁴Latest monthly data.

⁵Army, October 1943; Navy, August 1943.

Sources: Public Assistance and Old Age and Survivors' Insurance, Social Security Board; Veterans' Pensions, Veterans' Bureau; Federal Employment and Civil Service Retirement Benefits, United States Civil Service Commission; State and Local Government Employment, Bureau of Census; Public Education, Constants used by Bureau of Census; Military Allotments, War and Navy Departments; Railroad Retirement, Monthly Review of Railroad Retirement Board, includes retirement operations and lump-sum death benefits.

PRICES—THIS WAR COMPARED WITH LAST

I am also inserting herewith a table showing how the cost of the war has been held down and how the cost to consumers in our country has been held down during this war as compared with World War No. 1. It is as follows:

Percentage increase in the cost of living after 48 months of war—World Wars No. 1 and 2¹

	World War No. 1	World War No. 2
	Percent	Percent
Cost of living, total.....	50.3	24.9
Food.....	63.9	46.7
Clothing.....	85.3	28.5
Rent.....	3.2	3.5
Fuel, electricity, and ice.....	35.2	10.6
Household furnishings.....	77.2	24.8
Miscellaneous.....	49.9	15.7

¹World War No. 2 data show change between August 1939 and August 1943, except for rent, where the latest available figure is for June 1943. World War No. 1 data show changes between July 1914 and July 1918, except for fuel, electricity, ice, and miscellaneous. No monthly data are available for these categories; therefore the figures show the change from the yearly average of 1914 to the yearly average of 1918.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

COPPER, LEAD, AND ZINC SUBSIDY

I am inserting herewith a table showing how the copper, lead, and zinc subsidy has worked in the public interest. The subsidies on these three products have saved the consumers, including the Government's war cost, more than

\$2,000,000,000 for the year 1943. It is as follows:

Difference between cost of copper, lead, and zinc under highest prices reached during World War No. 1 and under present premium price plan

	Copper	Lead	Zinc	Total
1. World War No. 1 highest price (cents per pound).....	37	12 $\frac{3}{4}$	27
2. World War No. 2 ceiling price (cents per pound).....	12	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 $\frac{1}{4}$
3. Difference (cents per pound).....	25	5 $\frac{3}{4}$	18 $\frac{3}{4}$
4. 1943 production (million short tons).....	3.2	1.0	1.3
5. Cost of difference between ceiling price and World War No. 1 high (millions of dollars).....	1,600	115	488	2,203
6. Premium payments (millions of dollars).....	35	9	34	78
7. Net difference (millions of dollars).....	1,565	106	454	2,125

I am also inserting herewith a table showing the net savings to consumers of fuel oil in the New England States by reason of subsidies on transportation. It is as follows:

Savings from subsidy on transportation of petroleum products into district 1

	Average per barrel	Aggregate
	Dollars	Millions of dollars
1. Price increase that would be required without subsidy.....	1.20	606
2. Actual price increase.....	.43	216
3. Gross saving.....	.77	390
4. Subsidy.....	.20	100
5. Net saving.....	.57	290

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Without making any argument on the subsidy question, I simply wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that on December 1 the O. P. A. and its sister agencies forced a subsidy on the cheese industry of Wisconsin without asking the cheese industry or the cheesemakers or the men who produce the milk or produce the cheese. If the gentleman will take the time to look up the record, he will find that every month since December 1, 1942, there has been a reduction in the production of cheese. If a subsidy is going to increase production, that is one thing, but if it is just a plaything for some super-duper federally financed agency, that is another thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report from the

Special Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore granted by the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] for 30 minutes.

THE ALUMINUM SITUATION

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the facts concerning the production of aluminum, its present supply and control of both the production and raw material sources seem to me to present a picture shadowed with the gravest of implications. This picture, involving as it does, the very safety of our Nation is one which cannot longer be ignored. The factual record seems to be unmistakably clear. No matter whose figures are used, it is evident that the vital problem of a future supply of aluminum has been and is being shockingly mishandled. The present critical state of our vital aluminum supply, highlighted by a series of conflicting and contradictory statements dating back to December 1939, demands a full and complete examination and discussion. The motivation responsible for this situation should be searched out and brought to light.

Apparently at no time during the last 4 years has a long-range over-all plan for aluminum production and future supply been clearly and concisely outlined by anyone. Let me cite a few items from the printed record on this subject appearing in the daily press. On August 12, 1939, Mr. I. W. Wilson, vice president of the Aluminum Co. of America, testified in the antitrust suit that Alcoa can "supply the United States Government, both Army and Navy with all the aluminum it will require for national defense within the next year" and "a substantial surplus" for the British "on top of ordinary domestic requirements."

Then, 1 year and 3 months after that, on November 25, 1940, in fact, President Arthur E. Davis of Alcoa, in a letter to a customer, the Reynolds Co., made this statement:

Just now we are rather hard up for aluminum. No further commitment on our part is possible.

However, just 3 days later, on November 28, Marion B. Folsom, expert adviser on aluminum for the National Defense Advisory Committee stated:

There is certain to be plenty of aluminum for this country's military and civilian requirements with the British plane program

in addition. If necessary the United States can supply all the aluminum, without recourse to sources abroad. There is ample ore in Arkansas for all needs for several years. There is no need for priorities in the aluminum industry because expected production will allow for increases in civilian use.

But less than 1 month later, on December 24, 1940, newspaper headlines read, "United States aluminum shortage reported — National Defense Advisory Committee considers mandatory priorities." The story went on to say that Northrup Aircraft Corporation announced on December 23 curtailed production because of the aluminum shortage. Then, a few days later on December 29, Mr. Stettinius, then chairman of the National Defense Advisory Committee, contradicted that by saying that there was no serious shortage in aluminum supply for aircraft and other military items now required for national defense.

However, just a half month later on January 15, 1941, Glenn L. Martin reported that slow aluminum deliveries were delaying plane production and the House Naval Affairs Committee held hearings and received testimony concerning delay in aluminum deliveries holding up plane production.

Just 1 month later the New York Times remarked editorially:

It is a temporary sort of bottleneck that seems to have occurred lately with regard to aluminum.

But the Times was too modest in its statement, because less than 10 days later on February 24, mandatory priorities on aluminum were placed in effect by the Office of Production Management and Mr. Stettinius stated that the situation had changed within 2 months.

A week later on March 1, the Office of Production Management announced that most of the current aluminum supply would be required for defense. And, 2 weeks later on March 15, announced rationing of aluminum for civilian uses with cuts ranging up to 75 percent.

Those confusing statements were all made within a period of slightly more than a year and they serve to illustrate the almost total lack of knowledge by those in authority on the subject of aluminum needs and aluminum production.

It soon became evident, however, with the need emphasized by the sharp step-up in airplane production, and with plans for the future calling for heretofore unheard of numbers of planes, that the aluminum problem for war was much too large a one even for the gigantic Aluminum Co. of America, and a genuine program of increased aluminum production was then launched. The success of the program to increase aluminum production is unquestioned. Our highest production prior to the war was 200,000 tons per year. A really brilliant job of plant expansion, accomplished by the War Production Board with the cooperation of the Defense Plant Corporation, the Aluminum Co. of America, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Reynolds Metals Co., has multiplied aluminum production more than six

times. Our production this year will run to 1,250,000 tons.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could conclude my speech at this point for I have recited what is apparently a success story. It is a story told us over and over again and is a story of achievement in which we may well take great pride. Less than 2 weeks ago, in fact, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, acting head of the War Production Board, told a group of Members of Congress, of which I was one, that the aluminum situation for war was in splendid shape and, to use his exact words, he said, "We have so much aluminum that it is running out of our ears." Mr. Wilson was obviously proud of the achievement of the War Production Board in thus meeting the emergency need for aluminum.

But the story of the current large production of finished aluminum just recited is not the whole story. It represents merely the show window of the true aluminum situation. I cannot imagine how Mr. Wilson or anyone else can find pride or comfort in the actual facts of our aluminum supply situation.

Mr. Speaker, I will now endeavor to set forth some of the facts behind the afore-mentioned window dressing. These facts may be obtained or verified by anyone from easily available sources.

Two principal steps are required in the production of aluminum: First, a fine white powder called alumina must be extracted from the ore by a process of crushing, washing, and chemical action. Secondly, alumina is then converted into the product we know as aluminum by an electrolytic process. The principal raw material or ore from which alumina is obtained is known as bauxite. As the industry now operates aluminum cannot be made unless there is alumina to make it from, and the alumina cannot be obtained unless we have bauxite from which to obtain it. In other words, our splendid plants constructed and equipped and producing 1,250,000 tons of aluminum annually are just so much junk unless they have available to them the raw material from which to produce the finished aluminum. Obviously then, we should have readily available vast stores of bauxite.

But we do not have a supply of bauxite in the United States to last longer than 2 years.

Estimates of the remaining bauxite deposits in this country vary widely. The aluminum industry is geared to the production of alumina from high-grade bauxite. Of this material there is probably not more than 8,500,000 tons remaining although there is a reliable estimate that I have seen that lowers this figure to less than 6,000,000 tons. Translated into time, this supply of bauxite remaining in the United States will maintain our aluminum industry which uses 7,000,000 tons annually, approximately 1 year. When that supply of high-grade bauxite is gone, it is gone forever. So far as it is known today there are no more deposits of high-grade ore worth mentioning. About a year ago the Bureau of Mines sent out

20 exploration parties to hunt new bauxite supplies. These explorations are still going on and it is reported that some 6,000,000 tons or more have been located. But not much of this ore is considered high-grade material and the aluminum industry is definitely geared to the use of high-grade bauxite. If we include the low-grade ore deposits along with the remaining high-grade ore, we probably have enough bauxite, both low and high grade, to run the aluminum industry at its present rate for 3 years. I am informed, however, that the processes for using the low-grade ores, the term "low grade" meaning bauxite containing more than 8 percent silica, are not yet completely successful and it is reliably stated, also, that new discoveries of bauxite deposits are deep in the ground and contain more iron than current reduction processes can cope with. In addition to this, more than a year would be required to do the necessary preliminary mining work. I think, therefore, that we must conclude that the available and dependable supply of bauxite, including a usable amount of low-grade ore, cannot be counted upon to last longer than 2 years from this date.

How then can our sorely needed production of airplanes be continued, when our bauxite supply is gone? The answer is that it is entirely possible that it cannot be continued at all if war reverses should stop our bauxite fleet. If plane production is continued, it will only be by the use of vast amounts of shipping space and with the sacrifice of lives of sailors and gun crews plus the maintenance of a small army of occupation in a country with which we are not at war.

A large portion of the bauxite ore we are now using comes from Dutch Guiana in South America and must be shipped up the Atlantic coast and through the Caribbean Sea. The bauxite for the Canadian aluminum plants which we supply is shipped up the Atlantic coast from British Guiana in South America to the plant in Canada. Dutch Guiana is our principal source of the raw material from which aluminum is made, and presently, when the Arkansas deposits are gone, it will be our only source of this material unless steps are taken immediately to secure a supply of raw materials from other and readily available sources within the United States.

Bauxite is not the only raw-material source for the production of aluminum.

It is possible to produce alumina from aluminum-bearing clays, which exist in many parts of the United States in unlimited quantities. This is not a new and suddenly discovered fact. The Aluminum Co. of America, the War Production Board, and the Bureau of Mines have known about processes for extracting alumina from clay for a considerable time. Even though scientists have long ago checked and approved at least five different processes for obtaining alumina from clay, only a mere handful of alumina is now being produced from that source. In spite of all of the facts I

have just stated, the War Production Board not long ago announced a decision denying the construction of plants in the United States for the perfection of three processes for producing alumina from clay.

The history of the several efforts which have been made to get preliminary plants for the production of alumina from clay into existence is a record of delay and disappointment. Although such development should have been started more than 2 years ago, it has not yet begun, and there is no evidence as of this hour to indicate it ever will be begun on a scale that will insure national security of an aluminum supply in the face of any war reverses.

On March 16, 1941, a detailed proposal for the construction of a plant for the production of alumina from domestic alunite, a type of aluminum-bearing clay found in the State of Utah, was presented to the Interior Department and defense officials by responsible individuals. This proposal was promptly acted upon by the Bureau of Mines, which reported favorably on the proposal on April 18, 1941. On July 6, approval of the alunite process was announced. However, emphasis was still being placed on bauxite importation, and on June 17 of the same year, 1941, Arthur E. Davis, chairman of the board of the Aluminum Co. of America, testified before the Senate committee, expressing concern over the inability to obtain enough ships to get bauxite ore into this country from South America.

In November 1942, after considerable investigation, engineering, and chemical study, several developers of processes for producing alumina from clay appeared, but at that time it was stated that the processes were not sufficiently developed. But oddly enough, along with that announcement came a statement that plans were already being made for the expansion of alumina production from monopoly controlled bauxite from Dutch Guiana.

Early this year, however, the National Academy of Sciences approved three new processes for the development of alumina from clay. The Academy gave its approval for the construction of minimum size plants in three regions, one in the South, one in Wyoming, and another in the Pacific Northwest. By midyear all three proposals had cleared the various steps and were finally approved for construction by the War Production Board. But on or about the 18th of July, approval for construction of the plant in the Northwest was withdrawn because of an alleged shortage of manpower in Oregon and Washington, and early in September, it was learned that approval had been canceled by the War Production Board for the construction of the other two plants on the ground that the development of alumina from clay was unnecessary. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to make what some might consider an attack upon a business enterprise, an industry, if you please, that has loyally endeavored to meet its war-production obligations. Nevertheless, in order to pre-

sent a clear and understandable picture of this entire situation, I must speak plainly, very plainly.

Until very recently, the Aluminum Co. of America was the only producer of virgin aluminum in the United States. It has held this unique and very profitable position for 53 years. Down through the years, this company did a good job of improving its methods and of finding new uses for aluminum and of getting widespread distribution of the metal for the benefit of the people of the country. During that period, also, the cost of aluminum was reduced from about \$8 per pound to a few cents per pound. The company has always been ably managed and very farsighted. The amount of bauxite available in the United States being limited, this company soon obtained control of most of the entire available supply. The next most easily accessible source was in South America in Dutch Guiana and now the Aluminum Co. of America controls nearly all of the deposits down there. The remainder, I am told, are controlled by the British Aluminum Co.

Until the Reynolds Metals Co., formerly producers of metal foil wrappers, went into the business of producing straight aluminum, obtaining part of its alumina from a limited supply of ore near Lister Hill, Ala., the Aluminum Co. of America had a complete and total monopoly on aluminum production. It still controls 93 percent.

When we entered the period of war emergency and the time of need for vastly expanded aluminum production, this monopolistic situation had both great advantages and equally great disadvantages. The advantages consisted principally of large production with centralized control and a single producing company with which to deal. The disadvantages of the monopolistic situation in the aluminum supply are not so simple to enumerate nor so easy to identify. Being the sole and only producer of aluminum, the only knowledge of aluminum production available to Government war agencies came obviously from the Aluminum Co. of America. Practically all known supplies of raw material were controlled by the company. And there must still exist a very natural desire on the part of the owners and operators of the Aluminum Co. of America to protect its position and not permit the war emergency to destroy its very profitable monopolistic control of the vital metal.

If aluminum could be obtained in no other way than from bauxite, we doubtless would have to accept the situation as we find it and continue to run the risk of protecting bauxite shipping supply lines from South America. We might also have to continue to obtain our aluminum solely from a monopoly corporation. But there is another way of obtaining aluminum. It can now be obtained from clay. There is so much aluminum-bearing clay in the United States that a monopolistic control of the source of aluminum ores could not possibly be obtained by the Aluminum Co. of America

or any other corporation. In other words, the necessity in the interest of national security to provide a domestic and dependable and inexhaustible supply of alumina from clay will in fact destroy the 53 years complete supremacy in aluminum production enjoyed by the one company. It is not reasonable therefore to believe that this company would seriously lend any of its knowledge or any other help to proposals to establish alumina production from clays abundantly available in the United States. Least of all would the Aluminum Co. of America want to see the vast deposits of aluminum-bearing clay in the States of Oregon and Washington opened up and developed. Approximately 40 percent of all war aluminum production is in those two States. The manufacture of aluminum requires vast amounts of electricity. Cheap hydroelectric power is available from the enormous dams on the Columbia River at Grand Coulee and at Bonneville. The amount of aluminum produced from the Columbia River power plants within the last 12 months is equivalent to the metal requirements of 70,000 fighting planes. With power cheap and plentiful there and with alumina available from clays almost at the door of the plants, it is easy to visualize peacetime production of aluminum for the people of this country at unheard-of low prices and manufactured by numerous privately owned and competing enterprises. But if aluminum is not developed from Northwest clay deposits or from any other United States clay deposits, in commercial quantities, the Aluminum Co. of America will continue to enjoy its monopoly.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Briefly, for a question.

Mr. HAYS. First I compliment the gentleman very much and appreciate what he is giving us in the way of information. I come from the State of Arkansas, where we have this large supply. I wondered if the gentleman was aware of the efforts being made to deal with this iron-content problem in the supply of bauxite, that is available in Arkansas, and if he can enlighten us on the possibility of that relieving the situation?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I can only say that my information is limited. It is known that there are new discoveries, and that they do have a high percentage of iron. The Bureau of Mines tells me there is some doubt about the efficiency of the process for obtaining alumina from bauxite which has a high iron content and therefore they do not really know as yet what the production from these deposits will be.

Mr. HAYS. The available supply, according to my information, is in the hands of independent owners.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Of the new deposits?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, to compliment the gentleman on the dissertation that he is giving us on this all-important subject, and in connection with that to ask him if he has familiarized himself with the Walthall process, that was announced some 2 or 3 years ago by the Tennessee Valley Authority, the so-called process of extracting alumina from clay. In that connection I would like to say that about a year ago in a conversation with Dr. Miller, the Chief Chemist of the Tennessee Valley Authority, he told me that he was confident that with that process at its then point of development aluminum could be produced in quantities at 15 cents per pound, which was the then prevailing price of aluminum, and I saw him actually making aluminum in a pilot plant, capable of turning out 1 ton a day.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I know that is correct, and I believe that process is now one of those under discussion. Is that the one located in South Carolina?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand it, these plants to be located do not confine themselves to any particular process but would concern themselves with the supply of the entire field, the use of both clays and low-grade deposits.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Different processes are known. They do work, but they have been delayed in the matter of development.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. I, too, compliment the gentleman on this very fine study of this important problem, and I ask if it is not true that there are a number of processes that have been approved by scientists and experts, who have given as their judgment the workability of that process, so that alumina may be developed from a number of different deposits which are located throughout the United States, for which we may obtain the raw materials to make aluminum.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I shall answer the gentleman by saying that it is very well known by Government agencies and many private individuals that there are at least six processes known to be proven and approved by the National Academy of Sciences, and passed by the Young committee, and at one time passed by the War Production Board but later three of them were withheld from development.

In time of peace we can and we have paid the prices as set by monopolies in various fields. We either pay the price or we go without—and undesirable as that situation may be to the public, it is not one that involves loss of life or any danger to national security.

But in time of war, the price we seem to be paying and perhaps shall continue to pay as a result of monopoly control of the vitally essential material, aluminum, is a large one indeed, for we are paying not only with money but in blood as well. It is a costly and dangerous business to ship bauxite ore from Dutch Guiana up the Atlantic coast to the United States. But we are doing it and have done it for

years and we will continue to do it on an expanding basis unless we have the wisdom to break the monopoly hold and establish the alumina from clay industries in the United States.

Hundreds of sailors have paid with their lives in an effort to keep the bauxite fleet running from Dutch Guiana. It would not be proper to reveal exact figures at this time, but I can tell you this, we have already lost more sailors and gun crews from bauxite boats than we would need in manpower numbers to build an alumina-from-clay plant in the Northwest. And yet they talk about a manpower shortage and cite it as the reason for not allowing that construction. To maintain even the present rate of importation of bauxite, the annual requirement is 200 shiploads, and let me point out that each ship carries a crew of from 40 to 60 men, including the gunners. That takes manpower.

General MacArthur and General Eisenhower would, I am sure, be very happy to receive 200 more shiploads of supplies of planes and ammunition each year the war goes on.

Nor is everything sweetness and light down in South America where this bauxite is mined. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House will recall that it was necessary to send troops to Dutch Guiana to protect the bauxite mines in that country with military force in order to prevent sabotage and disorders of the native population and to protect our supply of bauxite. I have never heard that those troops have been recalled. We still maintain this army there as a part of the price we are paying to protect a monopoly aluminum supply. I checked on that matter this morning, with both the War Department and the State Department, and I am told that the troops are still in Dutch Guiana and probably will remain there. And yet they say that manpower cannot be obtained to build a small plant for the development of alumina from clay in the Northwest. Only some 300 men would be needed.

I do not know what rate of wages the native miners of Dutch Guiana receive but I believe it is a fair guess that they are not paid anywhere near as much as are the American workmen who operate the bauxite mines in Arkansas.

Possibly the difference in wages is the reason, or there may be other reasons, but as of October 1, the mining of bauxite from our dwindling resources in Arkansas was reduced 65 percent, and the loyal miners who have toiled and strained to keep our aluminum plants producing by jumping their production from 100,000 tons per month to 700,000 tons per month are being laid off or put into other work.

I have had some interesting correspondence from the head of the International Union of the Aluminum Workers of America which I shall place in the Record at another time. The miners know this story and do not like it. I quote the concluding sentences in the letter written on October 4 this year by the head of Aluminum Workers of American Union to Mr. Arthur H. Bunker, Director

of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board:

Now along comes W. P. B. threatening to institute a strike of its own which will cut production 65 percent. I shall not "sell" this scheme to the Arkansas miners, not until the seaman tell us that the bauxite route is once more safe, not until the War Shipping Administration tells us that they have enough ships for the war fronts and not until the War Manpower Commission shows us that shortage of Arkansas labor is more crucial than the shortage of seamen. Until such time my conscience compels me to denounce your order and instruct our members to insist on continuing to get out the bauxite.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. NORRELL. Most of the bauxite deposits are in Arkansas in my own district. What the gentleman said is correct. There is no shortage of labor. We had a number of contractors who were induced to go in there and start production. Some of them have been laid off entirely. Others have been reduced in their quantity of production and many of them are going broke. They do have a very large reserve of bauxite, probably four or five million dollars worth, enough maybe to last this country a year, but it is deplorable that with that amount in reserve, production has been discontinued.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It is even more deplorable when we realize that the curtailment of 65 percent does two things. The employment goes to labor in South America when we do not have a labor shortage in Arkansas, and this curtailment compels additional sailors to risk their lives in bringing the bauxite here from Dutch Guiana.

There is another and very heavy and serious wartime price we are paying for the maintenance of the monopolistic situation of the Aluminum Co. of America. The rail transportation burden is very heavy. The Oregon and Washington aluminum plants use a total of about 600,000 tons of alumina per year. Alumina, which is obtained from imported and domestic bauxite, is a white powdered sugar type of war material that is used to feed the aluminum manufacturing plants, and is extracted from the ore in only three plants, all of which are located in the Southeast section of the country, in Arkansas and Louisiana. The average distance of shipment, therefore, from these alumina producing plants to Northwest alumina reduction plants is 2,600 miles.

Assuming that this alumina is shipped in standard freight cars having a capacity of 80,000 pounds, a total annual movement of 15,250 cars is required to maintain the Oregon and Washington aluminum production. This amount of rail shipping continually ties up some 650 freight cars in loading, in transit, and unloading. Although when the entire amount of railroad freight capacity is considered, this item of 650 cars does not represent an extremely large percentage of the total. Nevertheless it is a substantial amount. And under present circumstances when our transportation facilities are loaded to the maximum, when freight trains are moving night and day and at fast speeds, and still unable to quite keep up with de-

mands, the additional burden of equipment requirements for alumina transportation to the Northwest could and should be relieved.

In terms of our future security, no matter how short the war turns out to be, and certainly no one can predict its length either in months or in years, it is essential that the clay processes be developed to commercial scale operation. Even if we did not use another pound of Arkansas bauxite, the reserves there are inadequate to support any future emergency aluminum program just as they have proven inadequate for this war.

The immediate development of United States alumina from clay processes is therefore absolutely necessary in order to provide security of supply for aluminum in the future, to save the lives of sailors and gun crews, to relieve protective troops now on guard at the South American bauxite mines, to relieve the burden on both ocean and rail shipping, and for the future as a guaranty of free competitive enterprise. There can be no bona fide excuse for further delay in developing domestic alumina production.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 763) entitled "An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDING THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, with House amendments, insist upon the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. ELSTON of Ohio, and Mr. HARNES of Indiana.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I was granted permission to address the House for 15 minutes following the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McCORD]. The gentleman from Tennessee has kindly consented that I may proceed at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN FLORIDA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, something is happening—something dramatic and fundamental—to the way of life itself

on the American farm. Because we who constitute the legislative and executive branches of this great democracy are responsible for this phenomenal change, we should, in my opinion, give serious thought to what it means in the present and in the future.

I am speaking of rural electrification, not only in my own State of Florida, but in the 46 States whose farm people are being served with electricity through the rural electric cooperatives.

When we of the Congress set up the Rural Electrification Administration 8 years ago to sponsor and guide and lend money to farm cooperatives, little did we dream that within such a short time 1,300,000 farm people would avail themselves of what has become such a truly great development.

It is the purpose of R. E. A. to carry electricity to farm communities which have not been able to receive it from other sources. Owing to high operating cost, municipal power plants and privately owned utilities have not been able to embark extensively upon service in rural communities. To carry current to isolated farms would mean loss of money to the municipality or to the company. Farmers themselves doing their own management economically are able to serve themselves with electrical current at a minimum cost and without money loss. In Florida as a whole, friendly electrical service relations exist and R. E. A. is bound to expand in sparsely settled rural areas.

THE SITUATION WAS OVERRIPED

There must have been some reason for the success of this program—and that reason today is obvious. Only 10 percent of the farm people of America enjoyed the blessings of electricity in their homes when R. E. A. was born. The farmers in the South and the North and East and the West had been gradually becoming poorer and increasingly discontented for more than a decade. No one seemed to understand just why. Perhaps there were many reasons, but this one significant fact stands out: This had become an electrical age in which, throughout commerce and industry, 2 cents worth of electricity was doing the daily labor of one man. Farm people found themselves still pumping their water by hand; still milking their cows by hand; still hauling their feed to town for grinding; still washing their clothes by hand; still using the old wood or coal cook stoves; still spending hot hours over the old flatiron; still without refrigerators in their homes; still without radios. It is true that the farm does not lend itself as easily to electrification as does commerce and industry, but it is also true that with electricity the farmers can substantially increase their incomes; lighten their burdens; improve their health and add to their comfort and happiness in living.

During all the 19 years I have served in the Congress, I think I have never done anything of which I am today more justly proud than my support of not only the original Electrification Act but subsequent legislation as well. The rural electric cooperatives of America—private successful corporations of farmers—are, I am happy to observe, today serving

approximately 29 percent of America's farm homes. In my State of Florida there are 12 cooperatives serving a total of 8,339 farmers. What is more important perhaps for our immediate consideration is the fact that in the United States there are 6,000,000 farm homes and farm establishments still unserved, and in my State of Florida alone there are 42,648 still unserved.

THE RECORD OF THE "CO-OPS" IN FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. Speaker, when the prediction was made that during the year 1942 more food would be produced than during any other year in our Nation's history, we heard the cry from the far corners, "It can't be done." People everywhere were conscious that the farm boys and the farmhands and, in many cases, the farm operators had gone to war. One out of four of them had left the farm to either enter the armed forces or work in the war plants. There was fear that the country's food supply might dwindle to an all-time low. But those who held such fear had failed to reckon with this new force in the farm economy—with this new servant who had come to replace the boys who had answered their country's call. Senator George Norris, coauthor of the R. E. A. Act, speaking of this new force at the first national convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis last January, said:

This electricity that gets into the farm home means a new helper in that home, and she is a remarkable helper, too—the harder she works, the better she likes it, and the longer she works and the more she works, the less she charges for it, and she never takes off any Thursday afternoon or forenoon, either. She works 24 hours a day and enjoys every minute of it. That is the kind of helper the Rural Electrification Administration has brought into the farm home. The helper is grinding the feed, pumping the water, doing all kinds of work, and the more he does, the better he gets, the cheaper he gets, the more efficient he becomes.

This, my friends, is the secret of America's record food production in 1942.

Because of scarcity of copper and of steel and other materials, the War Production Board stopped all construction of rural electric lines by its P-46 order of July 21 last year. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association—the national association of the cooperatives—of whom my former colleague, Clyde T. Ellis, is the executive manager, believed that by connecting more and more farms, substantially more and more food could be produced. We owe a vote of thanks to the national association of the cooperatives for doing the research which finally convinced the War Production Board as to what this new farm servant could do. The national association told the War Production Board that the composite opinion of the cooperatives was that 23 percent more of the vital foods could be produced on the then unelectrified farms if electricity could be made available to them. The War Production Board and the War Food Administration, by a series of orders, have permitted and are today permitting rather extensive

construction for the electrification of still more farms.

William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, speaking before the cooperatives of Georgia on the 12th day of this month said, and I quote from his address as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator GEORGE on Monday of this week:

Spot checks in representative areas have been made to determine the effect of the electricity on farm production among these newly connected farmers. These spot checks indicate that the benefit to livestock production through the ability of the farmer to maintain his present production with decreased labor, or increased production with present labor, is equivalent to 34 percent.

And he went on to say:

The labor saved by the availability of electricity may have been almost equally reflected in increased production of field crops.

Think of it gentlemen, an increase of 34 percent because of electricity being made available to the farm home.

I am hopeful it will be possible for this program to continue to expand even during the war because I am deeply aware that every day that passes, as we liberate the occupied countries and attempt to feed their poor, starving people, increases the burden and demand on the American farm. This new servant, electricity, while at the same time vastly helping our own people, may be directly responsible for saving from starvation perhaps hundreds of thousands of helpless men, women, and children.

But, gentlemen, this program has had hardly more than a glorious beginning. It is the duty and responsibility of all of us here to assist in every way possible to do all of the preliminary work so that the day the war is over, construction can get under way in order that the unserved 66 percent of the American farm homes can be likewise blessed.

I am happy to announce that I am advised by the Rural Electrification authorities that many additional projects are being planned and prepared. Think of the happiness it will bring to 6,000,000 farm people. Think too of what it will mean in terms of employment in the factories that will produce the materials and employment in actual construction and operation in the rural areas—employment for these young men who are going to be coming back pretty soon from the far-flung battlefields of the earth.

And the beauty of this program is that it costs nobody anything. I grant you that the Government lends the money but the Government turns around and borrows the money on the mortgages given by the cooperatives. Actually this money is costing the Government less than 1 percent. The Government loans the money at from about 2½ to 3 percent interest and I am reliably informed that the Federal Government has benefited around \$7,000,000 on these R. E. A. loans, even after the total cost of the administration of R. E. A. to date is deducted. All loans are self-liquidating.

I desire, therefore, to call to the attention of every Member of this House the fact that there is pending before us

today what is known as the Russell-Rankin bill, a bill designed to make it easier for these cooperatives to connect more members and especially in the more sparsely settled areas.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman RANKIN, wherein he said to the cooperatives of America, "Electricity is the lifeblood of an advancing civilization."

FARM LEADERSHIP

Mr. Speaker, I speak feelingly concerning the welfare of the farmers of our Nation. I was born and reared on a small farm in Bradford County, Fla., and performed the usual duties, services, and labor, I hope, of the average farm boy. I have chopped wood, sawed wood, pumped water, milked cows, and studied school lessons by the light of a kerosene lamp and by the light from the flame of the open fireplace. I have observed the usual duties performed by the mother and housewife of washing by hand, ironing with a flatiron in front of a blazing fire, cooking on the hot wood stove on a sweltering August day, and the many other usual duties. No; there were no electric fans or refrigerators; no electric lights or radios.

Now it happens that in the same community where I was reared, we have the R. E. A. The farm homes there of the neighbors of my childhood are now enjoying the economic aid, the comforts, and the conveniences of cheap R. E. A. current. Yes; they have there washing machines, electric wood saws, electric feed grinders, electric irons, fans, refrigerators, cooking stoves, sewing machines, radios, and other electrical equipment and services.

From the soil springs the wealth of the Nation. Likewise from the soil springs, I have always believed, superior strength and citizen leadership. Your Nation today is drawing from its farm population and farm origin a large portion of its leadership in industry, finance, war, education, religious, and civic affairs. In my humble opinion, no American is greater than the farmer who lives and toils in the open under the blue canopy of heaven, and honestly and diligently wrings his living from the breast of Mother Earth. He shall in the future as in the past contribute his portion, not only in supplying the peoples of the earth with food and textiles, but also with great leadership in the affairs of men. Yes, they are entitled to rural electrification.

FLORIDA'S GREAT PART IN NAVAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it is indeed quite appropriate that we pause today to pay tribute to our great American Navy. In no period of the world's history has any navy surpassed in performance that which has been accomplished by the American Navy during the present global war. Far flung to every corner of the world, it has met the enemy in battle and in every instance where combatting forces were anything like equal in number, the American Navy has come out on top.

The brilliant performances of our Navy at Wake Island, the Solomon Islands, at

Midway, in the Battle of the Coral Sea, at Guadalcanal, Attu, Sicily, and in countless other places, will ever go down in history as the most brilliant of all armed conflicts.

Florida, I believe, can well point with pride to the wonderful training accomplishments of the Navy within this State. She has contributed the lion's share of pilots and other naval air-power personnel. The naval Air Operational Training Corps has operated most effectively at such well-known Florida naval air stations and auxiliaries as Pensacola, Jacksonville, Miami, Banana River, Key West, Vero Beach, Fort Lauderdale, Melbourne, Sanford, Daytona Beach, Lake City, Hollywood, and other places. Many of the 30,000 per year potential pilots and of the tens of thousands of naval air specialists are there trained under the most favorable conditions of any training in the world. High naval officials and the War Administration well recognized the unequalled opportunities, climatic and otherwise, in Florida for naval air operational training.

It is appropriate, I believe, also, that we should especially remember today the great American achievement during the pending conflict of generalship and naval-vessel construction. American shipyards have turned out more ship tonnage than all combined nations in any like period in the history of the world. Florida has done its part in this ship construction. Some \$40,000,000 worth of ships have already been completed and launched in Florida, and in Florida yards, \$186,000,000 worth of shipbuilding contracts are now under construction. The Federal Government has expended in my State for shore facilities, aviation and naval operating bases, approximately \$150,000,000 since January 1940. This, my friends, indicates in part the great degree in which Florida is participating in the naval program.

It is significant that so many of the Florida-trained pilots and other naval air personnel have participated in so many actual conflicts during this war, and I am proud to say that they, in the hottest of conflicts, have indeed acquitted themselves well.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McCord] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, if we are facing the hungriest world that has ever existed, as some of the thought at this time seems to indicate, then it becomes necessary that we be alert, to the end that our production may be kept up to the standard of efficiency so that when the hungry world does exist we will have something in our storehouse to take care of it.

I am not an alarmist, but anyone who has given serious consideration to the possibility of our agricultural industry's supplying food and feedstuffs essential to the needs of a world at war cannot escape the conclusion that a food shortage of grave proportions is apparent at this very time. I have been very closely associated with the farming and dairy industries during the greater part of my life and have watched with pride and

interest the development, particularly of the dairy industry, in my home State of Tennessee. For 20 years I have sold at auction considerably more Jersey cattle than any other man in the United States or Canada, and quite naturally I am especially interested in the present demoralized condition within our dairy industry. Scientists have proved that the dairy cow is the most efficient converter of feedstuffs into protein and energy-building foods. Food officials have shown concern at last over the unfavorable milk-production prospects in the East, South, and far West. Numerous suggestions have been put forth for remedying the present situation. It is not my purpose in this discussion to place any blame for this condition on any particular person, agency, or branch of our Government. We have been warned repeatedly that the condition we now find ourselves in was imminent. We have been too slow in taking steps to correct our mistakes and misguided efforts. I am anxious that we thoroughly understand the position we are now in, particularly in the dairy industry and that a program be developed immediately that will assure adequate production of milk for ourselves and our allies.

Briefly stated, the milk supply situation is this: Milk production is falling below last year's level even though we have more milch cows than ever before. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics predicts a total production for this year of 118,000,000,000 pounds as compared with 119,000,000,000 pounds last year. It is further predicted that the output next year may decline to 115,000,000,000 pounds. The goal set for next year's production as the minimum necessity to meet military, lend-lease, and civilian requirements is 122,000,000,000 pounds, which simply means that we are faced with a production next year falling 7,000,000,000 pounds short of the necessary minimum requirements. During the past 2 or 3 months production of milk has shown more than the usual decline. Total milk production for the month of August is estimated at 10,600,000,000 pounds this year, which figure is some 200,000,000 pounds less than the production in the same month last year. Milk production per cow was 5 to 6 percent lower on September 1, 1943, than on the same date last year. In some Southern and Southwestern States the percentage of decrease per cow is alarming. It is unnecessary to call your attention to the shortage of byproducts of milk at this time. Officials of the War Food Administration are evidently much concerned over this condition in that they have already established in 48 metropolitan areas a quota system limiting retail sales of whole fluid milk for human consumption and there is evidence that this program will of necessity be extended to other areas in the near future. While total milk production has been declining, the demand has sharply increased. It is estimated that there has been a 20-percent increase in demand for fluid milk for human consumption since 1941.

There are several reasons for this decline in production of milk. They might be listed in order of their impor-

tance as follows: feed situation, price-control policies, increased labor cost, shortage of machinery and equipment, and drought. Only the first two of these will be discussed at length.

In order to understand the condition that exists, it is necessary to review the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 relative to the establishment of ceiling prices on agricultural commodities. Probably no provision in the act provoked more bitter controversy than that section relating to agricultural commodities. There are approximately 50,000,000 people living on farms and 130,000,000 million people in our country dependent upon agricultural commodities for their very subsistence. This fact within itself was sufficient to insure a thorough hearing and consideration of the question in our Congress and I believe that the law as enacted is adequate to resolve the conflicting interests at present. Congress provided in this law that no maximum price should be established for any agricultural commodity below a figure which would reflect to the producer parity price for such commodity or the highest price received by such producer for such commodity between January 1 and September 15, 1942, and further provided that modification should be made in maximum ceiling prices established for agricultural commodities or commodities processed in substantial part from agricultural commodities in any case where it appeared that such modification was necessary in order to increase production or by reason of increased labor or other costs. Such a provision was a part of the bill from its inception and was justified on the ground that it would provide the producer with an adequate opportunity to realize the parity goal which is conceded to be a reasonable return to the producer and one that will assure adequate production. It is obvious, however, now, and was just as obvious at the time of the passage of this act, that if price increases in cost elements are permitted to endure for some time before a control is imposed, the result will be a justifiable demand for a higher price; for example, the original act precluded the establishment of maximum prices on agricultural commodities until these commodities had reached 110 percent of the parity price or a comparable price adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials. The price of wheat on March 15, 1942, was \$1.05 per bushel—110 percent of parity for wheat on that date would have been \$1.44 per bushel. The market price of corn on March 15, 1942, was 78.4 cents per bushel—110 percent of parity was \$1.04 per bushel; thus, it can readily be seen that Congress intended that wheat should rise 39 cents per bushel before price ceilings would be applicable and that corn should rise approximately 26 cents per bushel before ceilings would be applicable.

This is true similarly with other grains and feeds so that it is clear that when ceilings were placed on wholesale and retail sales of fluid milk and an increase in the essential cost elements, especially feeds, was thus encouraged by legisla-

tion that eventually there must be an adjustment in ceilings on wholesale and retail fluid milk sales, therefore, Congress quite wisely provided in the amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, that modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodities when it appeared that such modification was necessary to increase the production for war or where by reason of increased labor or other cost to the producers of such commodity the maximum price originally established would not reflect such increased cost.

With this picture of the law under which we are operating in mind, we should consider the programs that have been adopted and the result of these programs regardless of who was responsible for them. It is presently conceded that we have entirely too much livestock. Official reports of the Department of Agriculture indicate that in spite of the fact that our 1943-44 feed supply is the second largest on record, being only 4 percent smaller than last year's yield, that because of record livestock requirements, stocks of feed grain carried over at the close of the year are expected to be the smallest since the drought years and that the rate of feeding per animal unit on January 1, 1944, is expected to be 10 percent below the 1942-43 rate. Some grain has been brought in from Canada, but shortage of shipping facilities and other problems sharply limit supplies that we may expect from this source. Stocks of wheat are running low and will be insufficient to meet the winter's needs. The War Food Administration has, therefore, suggested sharp reduction in the number of hogs and beef cattle normally finished on grains and concentrate feeds. I am informed that the War Food Administration has further stated that milk production should be maintained at all costs. It is entirely possible, if this is true, that we may be confronted with the proposition of granting priorities on protein concentrate feed to the dairy cow.

I sincerely believe that the ceiling price established on corn at the rate of \$1.07 per bushel, Chicago basis, and the support price placed under hogs, have dealt a more damaging blow to the dairy industry from the standpoint of increased costs of production than any combination of factors. It has placed the dairyman in a position where he cannot compete with hog producers for corn. The experiences the Commodity Credit Corporation has had since last May in trying to allocate corn to the industrial consumers, and the grave shortage of corn with which we were faced, are ample proof of the fact that this program diverted corn so essential to the manufacture of reasonably priced mixed feeds and protein concentrates to the hog. Farmers in the Corn Belt could not be expected to market their corn at \$1.07 when if fed to hogs it would bring the

equivalent of \$1.30 to \$1.40 a bushel. This corn shortage has been primarily responsible for the sharp incline in feed prices during the past 4 or 5 months. The processor of mixed feeds who is forced to pay in the open market, for example, \$50 per ton for oats or barley as a substitute for corn at \$33 per ton cannot be blamed for the fact that from December 1942 until August 1943 feed costs increased some 15 percent or more and that there has been even a greater increase since the latter date.

Available statistics indicate that at the time ceiling prices were placed on wholesale and retail sales of fluid milk for human consumption there was a fairly desirable relationship between milk and feed prices. With minor exceptions, I am informed, there have been few adjustments in these ceiling prices on milk, despite the fact that since the effective date of the regulation establishing these ceilings, feed costs have risen to a point where officials of the War Food Administration admit it has become necessary to subsidize producers in order to offset increased feed costs and assure adequate production of milk. It has been my experience that producers generally are opposed to a subsidy in this form. Thus we can readily see that what has actually happened is that the price at which the producer sells has been stabilized, while the price of feedstuffs so essential to his production has continued to rise and that the producer is not realizing a profit sufficient to assure adequate production. Such a condition is an inevitable consequence of the application and enforcement of only one phase of the Emergency Price Control Act as applicable to agricultural commodities. I believe that Congress has recognized in a sense that price is a predominant factor in assuring adequate production of agricultural commodities, and I further believe that where by legislation Congress has authorized the placing of price ceilings on commodities processed in substantial part from agricultural commodities and has further prohibited the placing or establishment of ceilings on other commodities essential to the production of the former commodities on which ceilings have already been placed until parity levels have been reached, that it is the obligation of Congress to adjust the former ceilings to compare favorably with prices of the latter after they have reached parity level.

It is a rather easy matter to criticize. It is often more difficult to suggest a solution. However, I believe that the solution of the problem confronting us is relatively simple and I offer the following suggestions. These suggestions are offered on the assumption that we must maintain our milk production at present levels, and if possible, meet future goals. The first thing probably that should be done, and I believe that such a program is now under way, is that the numbers of our livestock must be brought in line with our feed supplies. We must immediately establish a correct feeding value relationship between carbohydrates used in protein feed concen-

trates, principally corn, oats, and barley. This, I have been told, would require a slightly upward revision in present corn ceilings so as to place the dairyman in a position where he can compete with hog producers for corn. We must establish ceilings on all ingredients of dairy feed practically all which have reached parity level and are now subject to the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act. We must grant an upward revision of whole milk ceilings, particularly in those areas that have experienced the sharpest rise in feed costs and the lowest increase in prices of whole milk so as to assure adequate production which means a reasonable profit to the producer. If these things were done, there would be no necessity for the present feed subsidy program now being administered by the War Food Administration. It might be necessary and advisable to subsidize producers only to the extent of the costs of transportation of feedstuffs into the drought areas. It might also be desirable, if corn ceilings were raised, to subsidize industrial consumers of corn and wet and dry processors to offset their increased cost of production resulting from increasing corn ceilings. The number of such processors is relatively small and the program would require a relatively small expenditure as compared to the present subsidy being paid to millions of milk-producing farmers.

It might be argued that an adjustment of fluid milk prices in all areas to bring such prices into proper economical relationship with present production and distribution costs would increase the cost of living and thereby tend toward inflation. Such a proposition is a debatable one and accurate figures to support either side of the argument are difficult to arrive at. If we concede that there should be a general increase in fluid milk prices in the normal proportion to the increased feed costs, those in favor of subsidies would be in a much better position. However, we are not living in normal times and I can see no practical reason why a sufficient increase could not be granted to offset the increased cost of production without regard to normal procedures. Milk production generally has failed to meet established quotas and is currently less than corresponding periods 1 year ago; therefore, the necessity for immediate action to remedy the situation. It is frequently charged that the rise in prices in agriculture commodities is largely responsible for the degree of inflation we now face; however, of the rise in national income of \$42,000,000,000 from 1939 to 1942, agriculture has received 14 percent—86 percent of this rise has gone into nonagricultural incomes. The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that retail prices in fluid milk have increased 20 percent since January 1941. It has been estimated that the additional increase needed to offset the increased cost of production due principally to increased feed costs would raise this figure to 23.9 percent increase

over the January 1941 prices or 6.6 percent over the actual June 1943 prices. Using these figures as a basis, it is calculated that the suggested increase in retail prices necessary to maintain production of dairy products would raise the cost of living less than 1 cent a day or less than 1 percent.

It is conceded that the over-all cost of administering the present subsidy program will run 3 or 4 percent of the total amount of the subsidy payments. This cost alone is significant, but to my mind is negligible when compared to the amounts that will be expended by the producers throughout the Nation in complying with the procedure set up to handle the program to which I can say with confidence that 90 percent of the producers in my area are opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORD. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee for the very well-thought-out and very thoughtful expression on an extremely serious subject. I wish all Members of Congress were here to listen to the gentleman this afternoon.

Mr. McCORD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORD. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just want to say that I think my colleague has presented one of the most constructive approaches to this very serious problem. I am sure that the Jersey breeders of Tennessee used good judgment when they had him as their president for the number of years they did have him.

Mr. McCORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORD. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to add to that by saying, as one interested in milk production in a dairy district, that I have been intensely interested in his remarks. I may say that in my district in Michigan the farmers in one section, not radical farmers, are refusing to deliver their milk but are keeping it on the farms because all they do deliver they are delivering at a loss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record straight, it will be recalled

that this Congress has made a consistent effort to remove certain named individuals from the Government pay rolls. The Urgent Deficiency Appropriations Act of 1943 as enacted by the Congress prohibited any Government department or agency from employing at any time in the future after November 15, 1943, certain three named individuals unless they were appointed to the office by the President and confirmed by the Senate prior to that date. This provision in this urgent deficiency bill, as you will recall, represented a very distinct compromise between the attitude of the other body and the overwhelming sentiment of the House.

Among these individuals so named was one Robert Morss Lovett, who had been serving as Secretary of the Virgin Islands. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, in a display of venom and caustic criticism seldom indulged in by any high-ranking officer of the Government, denounced the action of the Congress of the United States. In so doing the Secretary of the Interior clearly demonstrated his contempt for the action of the Congress and indicated a fixed determination on his part to thwart the will of the Congress if he could devise a scheme to effect his purpose.

In this attitude he was apparently supported by the President of the United States, who sent a statement to the Congress with regard to his reluctance to the signing of H. R. 2714. In this statement, among other things, the President said:

This rider is an unwarranted encroachment upon the authority of both the executive and judicial branches under our Constitution. It is not, in my judgment, binding upon them.

Secretary Ickes taking his cue from the statement of the President that in his opinion the action of the Congress was not binding either upon the executive or the judicial branches of the Government has now determined to deliberately snap his fingers at the Congress and to retain Robert Morss Lovett upon the Federal pay roll notwithstanding. In a conversation yesterday with Mr. Ickes he advised me that he had just appointed Mr. Lovett to the position of executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands. He further advised me that such a position existed in the set-up down in the Virgin Islands and that he felt at perfect liberty to appoint Mr. Lovett to perform those functions. By the way, the appointment to this position does not require senatorial confirmation under general law.

I asked Mr. Ickes to send me a copy of his order so appointing Mr. Lovett to this new position and I received it this morning, or at least a photostatic copy of it, issued September 6, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert this order as part of these remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The order referred to follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, September 6, 1943.

Order No. 1870.

Pursuant to authority conferred by section 23 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (act of June 22, 1936, 49 Stat. 1813, 25 U. S. C. sec. 1405v), the executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands is designated as the official charged with the performance of the following duties:

1. He shall serve as chairman of the Police Commission, of the Board of Review and Equalization of Taxes, and of the Liquor Control Board.

2. He shall serve as a member of the Harbor Pollution Board, the Labor Policies Board and the Lottery Board.

3. He shall register patents, copyrights, and trade-marks in the Virgin Islands.

4. He shall participate in the supervision of programs relating to public welfare, health, and social security, of the juvenile school, and of the Virgin Islands cooperatives.

5. He shall serve as certifying officer.

6. Whenever the position of government secretary of the Virgin Islands shall be vacant, he shall record and preserve the laws enacted by the legislative authorities of the Virgin Islands.

7. Whenever the position of government secretary of the Virgin Islands shall be vacant, he shall promulgate all proclamations and orders of the Governor and all laws enacted by the legislative authorities of the Virgin Islands.

8. Whenever the position of government secretary of the Virgin Islands shall be vacant, he shall have custody of the seal of the Virgin Islands and shall countersign and affix the seal to all executive proclamations and all other executive documents.

9. He shall perform such other duties as may be assigned to him by the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

This order shall take effect immediately.

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KEEFE. In this order he stipulates the duties and responsibilities of the office of executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands. It is very remarkable, because having checked the substantive law that defines the duties and responsibilities of the secretary of the Virgin Islands I find on a reading of this order that Mr. Ickes, attempting to be very clever as he usually is, has provided that whenever the position of secretary of the Virgin Islands shall be vacant then this new executive assistant has all of the powers that are stipulated in general law as belonging to the secretary transferred to him. The office of secretary of the Virgin Islands I am advised by virtue of the action of the Secretary of the Interior is now vacant and Mr. Lovett whom this Congress tried to remove repeatedly from the pay roll of the Government has now been appointed by Mr. Ickes in clear and plain defiance of the expressed attitude of the Congress of the United States to another position in the Virgin Islands to which he has transferred the powers, the duties, and responsibilities of the office of Secretary of the Virgin Islands that he formerly occupied.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Is this Mr. Lovett one of the gentlemen who was investigated by the Kerr committee of the House?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Lovett is one of the gentlemen whom the Kerr committee recommended be separated from the pay roll and which this House by an overwhelming majority sustained, as the gentleman will recall.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does this appointment as assistant to the Governor carry more salary than the office of secretary of the Virgin Islands?

Mr. KEEFE. Unfortunately, the order setting forth the duties and responsibilities of the office of executive assistant to the Governor does not specify the salary, but under the general law under which the Virgin Islands operate I think it is safe to say that the salary that will be paid to this executive assistant will be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The question is squarely up to the Congress again. I wonder what the Congress is going to do about it. I wonder what the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department is going to do about it. That committee held hearings in addition to those that were conducted by the Kerr committee and in their report when that appropriation bill came before the Congress took the same attitude as did the Kerr committee. Are we as a Congress going to express our determination and then allow an executive officer of the Government to flout the Congress before all the people of the United States?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does not the gentleman believe there possibly might be some justification for an executive officer's doing a thing like that in view of the statement of the President to the Congress that a law passed by the Congress was, in the judgment of the President, unconstitutional and did not bind any executive of the Government or the judiciary? In other words, the President stated in a message to Congress that an act of Congress should not be observed by an Executive or even by the Supreme Court of the United States, whose function it is to pass upon the constitutionality of the laws passed by the Congress. I think that is one of the most dangerous statements ever submitted by a President to the Congress in reference to a law properly passed by the Congress and written on the statute books.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman that I am in complete accord with his statement and I think I referred to the fact that Mr. Ickes, no doubt, felt sustained in his action because of this message which the President sent to the Congress. But I want to call to the attention of the majority leader when he asked for a bill of particulars in connection with the speech I made Monday that I did give a bill of particulars. I want

to add this one to the specifications that are contained in that speech: I ask any citizen if he cannot see in this a situation where the Executive tells the people of this country that neither he nor the judiciary are to be bound by an act of the Congress of the United States. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whom I know has as high a regard for the fundamentals of government as I have whether or not he cannot see in that action the very evidence of fascism creeping into our own Government which I tried to describe last Monday. May I give him another one before he answers that?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman asked a question.

Mr. KEEFE. I will give the gentleman time to answer, but I want to put another one to him so he will answer both of them at the same time.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is awfully kind of the gentleman. I will listen.

Mr. KEEFE. I recall—and I think the gentleman recalls—that this action of the Secretary of the Interior is very similar to the action of the National Labor Relations Board a couple of years ago. It will be recalled that the Appropriations Committee of the House struck from an appropriation provision for the payment of the salaries of the Board of Economic Research in the National Labor Relations Board headed by David Sapoos. I am sure the gentleman recalls that. The action of the Appropriations Committee at that time was sustained by practically the unanimous vote of the House and the other body and become a part of the law by virtue of the signature of the President.

Now, what did the National Labor Relations Board do? It defied the Congress of the United States and changed the name of this outfit from the "Board of Economic Research" to the "Technical Service Bureau" of the National Labor Relations Board. It in effect told the Congress: "We do not intend to be guided by your instructions as contained in the report accompanying that bill. We have changed the name of the outfit. True, Sapoos and his entire gang are doing the same work, at the same salaries and occupying the same offices, but we are going to thwart the will of Congress by merely changing the name and we do not intend to comply."

We were compelled to go before the Deficiency Committee of the House and write into a deficiency bill a clear mandate to compel the National Labor Relations Board to do what this Congress had directly ordered it to do. I ask the gentleman, in view of the statement which he made last Monday, does he not see in that attitude upon the part of bureaucracy and administrative officers of Government, who go out of their way to flout the actions of Congress, under any accepted designation of fascism, the development of a Fascist threat in our own economy?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. In relation to this charge of yours on fascism, you are

bringing in a little small matter to support a broad statement of that kind. Of course, that is the last thing in the world the people of America are fearful of. As a matter of fact, the charge against Lovett was that he was a Communist or communistically inclined, as I remember it. Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin, trying to use that isolated case to support the broad statement he made the other day, endeavors to make Lovett out as a Fascist. The other day my friend had no facts to support his statements, no bill of particulars, and he is giving no bill of particulars now. If he wants to talk about the Lovett case by itself, that is one thing, but when he undertakes to bring that in to support the statements that he made about our national economy taking the road of fascism, then the gentleman states something that I challenge.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the gentleman concluded?

I gave the gentleman plenty of time to answer. The gentleman has not answered the questions or the arguments. The gentleman with his usual great intelligence apparently fails to see the point at issue at all. I do not think that he fails to see it. I think he sees it the same as Dr. Goodwin Watson said he saw it when he was before our committee. He is one of the great intellectual leftists of this country. He clearly pointed out the grave danger that is facing our country due to the spread of this doctrine that grows out of the centralized control that is being exercised over the lives of our people through unrestrained bureaucracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not need 10 minutes. Mr. McCORMACK. Five minutes?

Mr. KEEFE. I just want 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the distinguished gentleman, who ought to know better, and who as one of the leaders of this House investigated communism years ago, that if he took advantage of the information which he gained as a result of that investigation he would know there is not an intelligent person in the world who does not know that communism is Fascist in character, and that the only explanation that is given to communism to distinguish it from other Fascist philosophies is that its supporters contend that while it is Fascist in character it is benevolent in purpose.

I say to you that the gentleman has not answered the question I have proposed. This attitude on the part of bureaucratic heads of agencies and executive heads of the departments in flaunting the will of the people as expressed through their Representatives in the

Congress is the purest threat of fascism that faces our country today. I can think of no more direct threat than the contempt in which Harold Ickes holds the Congress, when he flatly refuses to do what the plain mandate of the Congress requires him to do and elects to battle the thing out to prove that the executives in the executive department of the Government and the administrators of the agencies of government have more power than the people's Representatives in the Congress itself.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. This question has troubled me a great deal: How far under the Constitution may the Congress go in virtually removing an employee of the Executive branch of the Government by refusing to appropriate for his salary?

Mr. KEEFE. That is a question which Mr. Ickes and those associated with him claimed they were going to take immediately into the Supreme Court of the United States for a determination. I stated on the floor of this House that I wished they would do so. I hope that question will be determined. I do not want it determined by the subterfuge that he has adopted of creating a new job and appointing Lovett to that job without attempting to solve the basic constitutional question that may be involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin is, of course, a strong advocate.

The gentleman made some observations about what I learned as the result of being chairman of an investigating committee. The gentleman from Massachusetts learned enough that the most powerful piece of legislation in the past 50 years to meet subversive influences in this country was passed as a result of that investigation, the McCormack Act, compelling foreign propagandists to register.

The gentleman has created a new theory, something new—the road of economic fascism. Of course, anybody who is an impartial observer or analyzer of current events realizes there is no foundation to that.

Further, he picks out this Lovett case as an illustration to support his theory. I remember that years ago a famous and outstanding President of the United States, when Chief Justice Taney, as I remember, made a decision the then President did not like, said, "Let Chief Justice Taney enforce the law." Certainly that is an outstanding observation, but I would never call it fascism.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NAVY DAY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, patriotic Americans throughout this country are observing this date as Navy Day. October 27 marks the anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth, and since he is regarded as the greatest advocate of safety through naval power in modern history, it seems to me that the selection of this date for an annual appraisal of our strength afloat is particularly appropriate.

I would like to point out that the year which has passed since the last observance of Navy Day undoubtedly has been an unprecedented year in naval history. The most powerful ships ever built have taken their places in our fleet. Never before have so many ships of all sizes and types been constructed and placed in service so quickly. We have become the possessor, through the will of the American people, of the greatest floating power that the world has ever seen. Today, as never before, the safety of this country and the sanctity of our shores depends upon these ships and the officers and bluejackets who man them. For this reason I think it might be well to consider some of their accomplishments during the past 12 months, and to weigh the responsibilities they face in the immediate future.

All of us remember, too well, those bleak and discouraging days immediately following Pearl Harbor. It is no secret now that during the months which followed that treacherous attack, the strength of our enemy surpassed that which we could throw into the Pacific. For the first 12 months after that black date the Japanese were able to progress southward at a phenomenal rate, ruthlessly subjecting unprepared and practically unarmed peoples to their will, committing a series of unprecedented atrocities and carrying on the most brutal type of warfare. At that time, we must admit now, we were unprepared to stop them.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out today that because of the very fact that American ingenuity and American industrial management was able to get behind the armed forces, and particularly the Navy, to the extent that they have done, the situation as it was 1 year ago has completely reversed itself. Exactly 1 year ago yesterday, the Navy proved beyond a possible doubt that it was an attacking force of terrific impact, capacity, and daring. For on the night of October 26, 1942, several hundred miles northwest

of the Santa Cruz Islands, the carrier task force intercepted a Japanese task force coming down with the obvious intention of retaking Guadalcanal.

Guadalcanal had been taken very dearly by marines on land and naval ships and air power at sea. The Japs wanted the prize back and were willing to pay dearly for it. They did pay an exorbitant price for their effort. But the effort itself was futile, for the Battle of the Santa Cruz Islands, as the engagement has now come to be known, went to the attacking power of the United States naval command.

Our forces on that occasion consisted of the carriers *Hornet* and *Enterprise*, one new battleship, the light cruisers *Atlanta* and *Juneau* and other cruisers and destroyers. The Japanese forces, which we know to have been of superior fire power and containing at least two battleships and three aircraft carriers, was completely and decisively whipped. In that battle we lost the *Hornet* and an accompanying large destroyer, the *Porter*. That grand ship, which for so long has been known as battleship X, but which the public now knows as the *South Dakota*, under the command of Capt. (now Rear Admiral) Thomas Gatch, put up a fight which will go down in our naval annals as one of the most decisive sea battles of all times.

Captain Gatch and his men have received many honors since the details of that battle became known to the public, but I assure you that these honors were well deserved. During that short battle, the *South Dakota* put up such a barrage of antiaircraft fire from the twenty 5-inch guns and dozens of smaller antiaircraft guns that no less than 32 Jap planes attempting to sink her were brought down. The *South Dakota*, herself, received some direct hits but was able to keep firing until the surviving Jap ships turned tail and ran.

In the fall of 1942 our naval forces began what we might term the offensive phase of this war in earnest. Last November 8, the world was electrified by the news that the United States was invading Africa. That invasion, Mr. Speaker, was a sea-borne thrust on a gigantic scale. The Navy escorted an unbelievable number of ships safely across submarine-infested waters and got them there on schedule, and safely.

Naval gunfire played a large part in that invasion just as it did in stopping the German tanks and saving the beachhead at Gela in Sicily, and in turning the tide of battle in the first bloody hours of Salerno, almost a year later. To show you what part the Navy played in that operation, let me point out that during the first 12 hours of the invasion of the Italian mainland, the Navy lost more men than the Army.

Only a few days after the initial thrust into Africa, and while our men were marching across Tunisia, there occurred the major battle for Guadalcanal, which dwarfed all previous ones in number of enemy warships sunk or damaged. It also marked the first major naval encounter without the use of carriers by either side. This battle was fought at

close range, in darkness, and once again American fire power and American seamanship demonstrated its superiority over that of our foes.

And so, motivated by a spirit of attack and attack wherever possible day in and day out, we carried the fight to the Japanese well into 1943. And this year, because of the naval power including air and submarine power that we have been able to develop, we have seen the retaking of the Aleutians, the invasion of New Guinea, New Georgia, and the conquest of Sicily and southern Italy. Some 2 years ago naval authorities promised that the year 1943 was to witness our attacking forces shaped into a spearhead of might, brains, and strategy, rocking the enemy in the Pacific, the Atlantic, and the Mediterranean. I need not point out to you today, Mr. Speaker, how true this prophecy has proved to be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman in speaking in observance of Navy Day has mentioned certain ships of the Navy and has also mentioned a crucial battle. In that battle we unfortunately lost the *Hornet*, but another ship that did high honor to the country and to the Navy, the *Enterprise*, is still afloat, as far as I know. I know the gentleman will bear with me while I read into the *Record* at this point the citation the President recently awarded the *Enterprise*, which is known as the pride of the United States Fleet:

CITATION

For consistently outstanding performance and distinguished achievement during repeated action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area, December 7, 1941, to November 15, 1942. Participating in nearly every major carrier engagement in the first year of the war, the *Enterprise* and her air group, exclusive of her far-flung destruction of hostile shore installations throughout the battle area, did sink or damage, on her own, a total of 35 Japanese vessels and shot down a total of 185 Japanese aircraft. Her aggressive fighting spirit and superb combat efficiency are fitting tribute to the officers and men who so gallantly established her as a solid bulwark in defense of the American Nation.

I think the *Enterprise* and such ships as the battleship *South Dakota* give good testimony to what our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is stating here today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. To recall to the House the gallant fight the *Lexington* made before she sank. She did great damage to the enemy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the officers who served in many of the engagements in which this great airplane carrier *Enterprise* was engaged is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], as a naval officer with the rank of lieutenant commander and one whose bravery and devotion to duty was demonstrated in full measure while

he was on active duty with the naval forces in the Pacific.

The Navy during this past year has maintained a bridge of ships from our Atlantic ports to Murmansk, to England, to Africa, and uninterrupted sea lanes to Alaska, the Aleutians, Australia, and the regions of the South Pacific. Today the route to Australia and the islands of the Pacific is a great highway dotted with our naval bases serving as service stations to keep supplies moving to our fighting men and our allies. Few people of this country realize, for instance, that more than \$3,000,000,000 in food and war material safely have been transported to Russia under convoy of the American Navy. From this past May through August the Navy escorted 4,000 ships averaging 10,000 tons each safely across the Atlantic. During these months our losses from submarines were less than one-half of 1 percent. All these miracles of salvation have come to pass in the last year. Why? Simply because, Mr. Speaker, sea power, or more properly what is now called sea-air power, made them possible.

We cannot deny today that we have suffered losses in ships and more regrettably in men, but I think that we can take consolation in the fact that enemy losses have been infinitely greater and much harder to sustain than ours. At the beginning of this war we estimated that Japan had 7,500,000 tons of shipping. Today at least one-third of that shipping is resting on the bottom of the Pacific, and our submarines, which had such a great part in sending them there, have very definite plans for similarly effective operations in the future.

Sir Francis Bacon once said, Mr. Speaker, that—

He that commands the sea is at greater liberty and may take as much or as little of the war as he will.

That has always been true and is still true. The seas are highways, and to wage intercontinental war, control of these highways, which are lines of commerce, is essential. Unless we control the highways, we cannot control the destination. We cannot hope to control a distant land, or the skies above it, unless we control the seas between these two points. We have learned that ships alone can no longer do it. And to resort to Bacon again, he said further that—

He that will not attempt new remedies must expect new evils.

Thus, we have learned through experience up to this time that modern sea power is an air-sea team. One without the other is inadequate. We must have the airplane, the battleship, the carrier, the destroyer, the submarine, all working together and all straining toward one objective—victory. The team, we know, is indivisible.

Only last week Secretary Knox announced that the United States Navy was constructing the three largest, fastest, and most powerful aircraft carriers yet to be built. This is another proof that air and sea power cannot be evaluated independently. Air power can strike the enemy where it hurts most, but to do so with any effectiveness it is dependent on

ships for gasoline, bombs, ground personnel, repair and maintenance facilities, supplies and, of course, first of all upon sea-borne men and machinery to build the distant air fields.

Sea power spoiled Napoleon's African adventure just as it spoiled Hitler's and just as it is proving a stop for the plans of Japanese militarists in the Pacific. I hope that the real meaning of sea power is becoming clearer and clearer to the American people as our offensive develops in intensity. I hope that the American people realize that without dominion on the seas, this war at best would become a stalemate and at worst a defeat. Let us not forget that sea power saved us from defeat and that it is the key to our victory. And it might be well for Congress at this time to reflect for a few moments on our past history before we make too many definite plans for future policies.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1812, we had a Navy of which this country was justly proud. But then we neglected it for 30 years. In 1845, we had a little scare and started building or talking of building, but the fright was soon over and with it any thought of naval expansion. There actually was no considerable program of naval expansion in this country until 1883 when the Federal Government was so prosperous that some money was spent on the Navy. Between the close of the War between the States and 1883, there had been no legislation allowing for new naval vessels. They could repair them but not build them. The Navy tried to get around this restriction by building a new ship on the keel of an old one—an action which caused Congress at that time, properly enough, to pass a law limiting expenditures for repairs to a percentage of the original cost.

When this country became so alarmed over the possibility of an invasion of our coast by Admiral Cervera's Spanish Fleet, we had only five good battleships designed for coastal events, but when the admiral's fleet reached the Azores, there was a terrific clamor in this country to increase the Navy, more quickly than the building facilities of that day could provide. But from the time of the Spanish War and on up through the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, this country was Navy conscious and they were convinced that our safety lay in enough ships with guns on them to defend our coast. When World War No. 1 spread over Europe, the American people were still in this mood and Woodrow Wilson, who certainly was a friend of the Navy, had little trouble in convincing our people or Congress that we must have an adequate fleet to meet the threat from the Kaiser.

But then we all know what happened after the World War. We had the Washington Disarmament Conference in 1922 when we decided to sink or scrap at least a million tons in good American fighting ships, including two brand new battleships already completed, seven battleships and six battle cruisers which were on the ways and building. It cost us some \$75,000,000 to scrap these ships.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, our record on defense is a spotty, erratic history—a history of indecision and confused perception of our responsibility as a Nation with tremendous overseas commitments and the responsibility for the defense of one of the longest coast lines of any nation in the world.

A distinguished physician once remarked, Mr. Speaker, that his only explanation for the survival of the human race was that women forgot childbirth so easily. Similarly it seems to be the same with war: people seem to forget the causes of war which generally turn out to be obvious signs of weakness. A nation unable to defend itself is always a temptation for conquest on the part of others capable of waging war.

On this Navy Day, I would like to leave these thoughts with the people of this great and prosperous country. At the conclusion of this war the United States will, for the first time in its history have the strongest naval power in the world—a circumstance of profound historical significance. It is my earnest hope that when our enemies are crushed, defeated, and disarmed, we will remember and go on remembering that in our sea power lies our security. We must not forget this fact, that the great Navy we have built at such a cost and with such travail is a mighty instrument in our hands for peace as well as for war. It will continue to be until new methods of war and commerce are devised or until man, the rational animal, with God's help, fashions the machinery of rational living and enduring peace.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the people of this country that our present generation of fighting men, the officers and bluejackets who are manning our ships, are displaying a nobleness of fighting spirit and a determination to win and to preserve this country for their children which is as striking and as heroic as any individual or collective acts of heroism preserved in the history books of this Nation. We owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to these men which we will find it hard to repay.

In describing the war which has been carried to the enemy by the American Navy, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to overlook the officers and men of the Coast Guard who have played such a gallant part in this war, nor the men of the Marine Corps, both of these fighting services serving with the Navy.

In our initial landing on Guadalcanal, for instance, the Coast Guard played an important part in landing the marines who stormed that Jap stronghold; the Coast Guard has been carrying on a continuing battle against submarines in the Atlantic and around our coasts; the Marines, as we all know, have formed the spearhead of our attacking forces everywhere in the Pacific, and have created new and magnificent traditions and records of accomplishments to add to their already-glorious history. More recently, the Coast Guard continued its great record of service to this country by landing many of our fighters on Sicily and the Italian mainland.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the most beneficial way through which we could

express our gratitude for what these men of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard have been doing would be to guarantee to the best of our ability that they or their children would not be called upon to go through a similar struggle at such a cost in life and waste of material. I would further suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the most practical way we could do this would be to preserve the American Fleet when our enemies are crushed, and use it, as the man whose birthday we are celebrating today wanted to use it—as a big stick to keep down the bullies of the world and insure freedom and the blessings of peace to those who come after us.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I would be somewhat derelict in my own duty to Congress today, sitting here listening to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] if I did not stand up—and I know I speak the sentiments of every Member of Congress—and pay tribute to him as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Today there was inserted in the RECORD a letter from the commander in chief of the United States Navy, Admiral King, in which he paid high tribute to Members of Congress for their unflinching devotion to the wants of the Navy, and of the work that we have done, and to every Member of Congress for what he has done to help win the war. The Navy requires that a great deal of legislative matters be acted upon promptly. I can say, and I know I again speak for all Members of Congress, that no civilian living today has done more, both before the war and during the war, for the United States Navy than has the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. Secondly, I know that Admiral King also refers in his tribute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] who as chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations has done yeoman work in aiding the establishment of the greatest fleet in the world.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. More than that, no living man in America today knows as much about the Navy as does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] in the very fine and deserving compliment that he has paid to our distinguished friend the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. Just one further observation: When

the history of this era and of this crisis is written, the name of the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, will stand out as one of the most prominent figures of this trying period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I am certain, has just expressed the unanimous feeling of this House in praising the work accomplished by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], together with the other members of this very important and able committee. The gentleman has spoken of the letter of praise and appreciation sent by Admiral King to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. Just a short time ago I was permitted the opportunity of reading this very fine letter from Admiral King.

Admiral King is considered an excellent naval officer, efficient and careful in the conduct of his operations. He shoulders a tremendous responsibility today and is an extremely busy officer. A letter of citation from him at this time, therefore, not only carries weight but brings honor to this House. His praise of the work of the Naval Affairs Committee and the cooperation, help, and constant labor of its distinguished chairman from Georgia not only is a fine tribute for work well done but constitutes an honor for these members for great accomplishment during this day, when every man is trying earnestly to perform his duty for our country. Expressing his appreciation for the cooperation and support of the Navy by the Members of the House is greatly appreciated. In reply to this fine letter I believe I voice the feeling of the House in saying we appreciate the great value to the Navy and to the country of our able naval officer, Admiral King, and the dynamic Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox.

Today is Navy Day. The attention of the people throughout the country, in fact throughout the whole of the civilized world is drawn to the accomplishments of the American Navy. Its great traditions and achievements of days gone by set the pattern for future achievements. Its glorious leadership of earlier days, molded the heroic leadership of today. America has confidence in its Navy. This confidence can only be justified in great ships, courageous officers, brave sailors, molded into the soul of a unit that is determined to strike forever until victory is gained.

In paying tribute to the Navy today, I salute a great and honorable friend of many years. Over a long time I have known its problems, its troubles, its desires. Throughout these many years I have stood solidly in complete support of all of its undertakings, its hopes, its desires. At one time there were only a few of us. Since Pearl Harbor I am proud to say, the membership of this House has unanimously supported the Navy in all of its undertakings. Today, the Congress is proud of the American Navy, the most powerful in the world.

A gigantic task lies ahead. It is almost beyond comprehension, and yet it must be comprehended. It requires a tremendous fleet; sound and accurate judgment based on accurate information; a knowledge of the enemy and his activities, brave, courageous officers and men acting together as a fighting unit. I cannot say how great this job is, but the Navy must know. I can say, and do say, with all my force, the job to be done is so important that it not only compels but commands efficient leadership and challenges that leadership to place in command of every ship and every branch of the naval service the ablest, best qualified, and most highly and competently trained men. There is no room for personal feelings, personal bickerings, personal aggrandizement, internal politics, and personal favoritism. This Congress will not tolerate any such actions, nor any smoke of internal discontent. The Congress wants this war victoriously finished as soon as possible and will vigorously oppose any action interfering with this objective. The best qualified man for the particular job to be accomplished is the ruling principle. There can be no other.

In paying tribute to the accomplishments of the Navy today, I am glad to point out to the Navy that the Congress has not permitted in the past, and will not permit now or in the future, any encroachment on its activities by other departments of the Government or by civilian agencies of the Government. We are well aware of and quite well informed regarding the activities, work, and jobs that must be performed by the military services. We will not permit any interference from any source whatsoever. The Congress knows the character and qualities of the Navy, its officers and enlisted men. The Congress has complete confidence in the Navy and is constantly standing by to help and protect whenever possible its functions and activities. The Congress is eternally vigilant.

In our tribute today, I salute the thousands of officers and men in the United States Naval Reserve. This very important group of men, without which the Navy could not function, made up of young men and older men, have given up everything in most cases, in order to fight beside the regulars for their country. It is a great sacrifice they are making. They have given up their careers. Many of these men will not have an opportunity to take their places again in civilian life.

Many of these men have had but very brief training in the Navy, with all there is they must know and yet have gone out in command of small ships. It is a tribute to the old-line naval officers who have trained them, and a greater tribute to the youngsters who have absorbed that training and who have fought so courageously and gallantly.

When regular naval men enter into the naval service, they enter from the viewpoint of a career and making a life work of it. They know what the future holds for them. But the Naval Reserve men have gone in by the thousands because the country was attacked and they wanted to do their part. They are per-

forming their duties today like line veterans and we are proud of their accomplishments. The Navy owes much, very much, to them. Their loyalty, their good will, constitutes strength for the Navy of the future.

In closing I should like to add my tribute, and praise to the distinguished Naval Affairs Committee for splendid work well done and to its most able chairman for his leadership and statesmanship.

To the great American Navy I salute all it stands for, all it has accomplished, all of its officers, enlisted men, heroes on the high seas, and the determined unnoticed heroes working steadily at their assigned posts of duty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a brief table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] made some interesting comments regarding a confidential O. P. A. study concerning profits in certain industries, particularly in the meat-packing business.

I hold no brief for the packers, nor in fact for anyone else. There are, however, certain features about the report which deserve further notice.

This O. P. A. report refers to certain figures as "profits before income taxes." We have, I am afraid, brought in some confusion lately by speaking about profits before taxes. To refer to profits without explaining that the figures represent earnings before payment of income taxes creates a distorted and unjustified picture. It would be just as logical to speak of profits before payment of wages or of freight charges. Every large company now has a heavy tax bill to pay. If it did not have a substantial sum on hand to pay its taxes it would probably be bankrupt. Also misleading is that no consideration is given to the fact that in one of the pre-war years, 1938, used by the O. P. A. as a basis of comparison, the meat-packing industry actually operated at a loss.

In 1942 net income after payment of taxes—and other expenses incident to

operating—per pound of meat sold by the industry was a fraction of 1 cent, the average over the 10 years, 1933-42 still being only a fraction of a cent, this including the year 1938 when substantial losses were suffered by the industry as a whole. During the 10-year period 1933 to 1942, inclusive, all manufacturing industries made an average profit of 5.3 percent on sales whereas the meat-packing industry made a profit of only 1.1 percent on sales of every description. In 1942 the volume of sales by meat packers was more than half the volume of sales for all food-manufacturing industries combined, but the volume of earnings in the meat-packing industry was less than one-fourth of that obtained by all food manufacturers combined.

It is unfortunate that the complexities of the meat business are not understood. Some packers handling the entire meat and byproducts line may have a hundred or more different processes, each of which can be, and with some companies is, a separate business. Some of these processes have been profitable—others highly unprofitable, and it follows that those processors handling only the unprofitable items in many cases either have been forced out of business or forced to curtail operations drastically.

Further, many industries have been operating on a cost-plus basis. This is not so in this industry. On the contrary the Government purchases at times have not even taken into account the actual out-of-pocket cost of the meat to the meat packer. So heavy losses instead of profits have been incurred on some of this Government business.

The meat-packing industry is for the most part efficiently operated. Years of experience and the utilization of byproducts have enabled the industry to produce at a very low margin of cost.

The following figures are profits after taxes as percent of net sales:

	1936-39 average	1942
Coca-Cola Co.....	34.7	19.0
E. I. du Pont de Nemours.....	29.7	12.2
General Foods.....	9.7	6
All meat packing.....	.7	1.2
<i>For industries</i>		
All food products, excluding meat.....	4.9	4.2
Automobiles.....	9.7	5.2
Chemicals.....	10.3	4.6
Agricultural implements.....	9.2	6.2

I also include a table showing a comparison of the operations of packers subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1938-42:

Comparison of the operations of packers subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1938-42

	1938, 815 concerns	1939, 830 concerns	1940, 821 concerns	1941, 829 concerns	1942, 815 concerns
Average net worth ¹	\$854,755,193	\$848,523,703	\$858,418,102	\$888,133,497	\$935,745,082
Total income.....	3,408,024,036	3,437,295,584	3,579,582,415	4,566,142,640	6,391,188,253
Total expenses.....	3,406,015,573	3,384,741,059	3,517,096,661	4,478,227,932	6,302,909,349
Net gain.....	2,008,463	52,554,525	62,485,754	87,914,708	88,278,904
Percentage net gain to net worth.....	0.23	6.19	7.27	9.89	9.43

¹ These figures represent the average of the total net worth of all reporting concerns at the beginning and end of their fiscal years.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion, training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold a hearing Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 11 a. m. on Friday, October 29, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 3142, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2203, to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes (relative to State income taxes, determination of domicile, etc.), also at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings

on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

882. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting copies of communications which have been addressed to the president of the Cuban House of Representatives by the presidents of the Chambers of Deputies of the Republic of Chile and Venezuela, concerning resolutions which have been adopted by those legislative bodies providing for special sessions on April 14 of each year; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

883. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Alexander Frederick Lebel from the group of 256 cases involving suspension of deportation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

884. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3366. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle; with amendment (Rept. No. 805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2641. A bill to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 807. Report on the disposition of certain papers from several agencies of the Federal Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to House Resolution 98. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation with respect to contemplated requirements with respect to the labeling, production, marketing, and distribution of articles and commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 3552. A bill to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3553. A bill to increase certain allowances provided by law for members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3554. A bill to amend section 1 (5) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide that the established railroad freight rates cover the receipt and delivery of loaded cars at the points of loading and unloading; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3555. A bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Utah Indian irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 3556. A bill to create an Army and Navy Maintenance Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 3557. A bill to authorize former members of the armed forces to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of belligerent nations or other American republics; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3558. A bill to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee prime contractors or of other subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 3559. A bill to centralize the purchase of paper for printing and binding and blank-book work in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By M. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3560. A bill granting a pension to Anna E. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio:

H. R. 3561. A bill granting a pension to Miss Mary Welsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3562. A bill for the relief of Edwin R. Samsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3563. A bill for the relief of Joseph Brunette; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3257. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Alma L. Davis and 32 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or trans-

3288. Also, petition of J. W. Chase and 13 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the

reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3289. Also, petition of Gordon R. Bimham and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3290. Also, petition of H. R. Fischuoller and 29 other residents of Spokane and Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3291. Also, petition of J. H. Abrams and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3292. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Ralph L. Wathser, Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3293. Also, petition of Albert Baker, of Washington, D. C., and 53 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3294. Also, petition of A. W. Edwards, of Washington, D. C., and 233 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3295. Also, petition of S. J. Rappapart, of Washington, D. C., and 12 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3296. Also, petition of Mrs. Alma Rappaport, of Washington, D. C., and 14 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3297. Also, petition of Charles Kucham and 99 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3298. Also, petition of William A. Stevens and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3299. Also, petition of Peter W. Senn and 60 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3300. Also, petition of Mrs. Jacob Devus and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3301. Also, petition of Elmer Markway and 54 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3302. Also, petition of F. Hummel and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3303. Also, petition of H. Koenig, Local No. 1, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of America, and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3304. Also, petition of Andrew Baum and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3305. Also, petition of J. Pfaff and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3306. Also, petition of H. Heiligenmann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3307. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of W. T. Moorehead of Roy, Wash., and 102 others, protesting against consideration by Congress of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, and condemning any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition, by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3308. Also, petition of the board of trustees of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, calling attention to the enormous quantity and food value of ocean fisheries, stressing specifically the incalculable benefits provided the Nation by the salmon fisheries of the Pacific Northwest; recalling the antebellum threats to the salmon and general fishing industry of the north Pacific coast by the invasion of Japanese and other foreigners; expressing apprehension at the possibility of such minatory interferences in the future; declaring now is the time to take adequate precautions against invasion by the Japanese and other foreigners; to be provided by the Secretary of State of the United States, with the cooperation of the Washington State delegation in Congress; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3309. By Mr. STEAGALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Dothan, Ala., urging the early consideration and passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, author of liberty, facing in these epic days determined foes who violate every cherished right which mankind has slowly won—and who would turn the wistful eyes of man backward toward the jungle, we thank Thee that more and more even the lurid glare of tyranny is revealing the spiritual glory of democracy as in Thy name it fights for its life. Startle us with the deep meaning for all mankind that a new moment has come in the old story of our planet. Strengthen our determination to seize the day as the full tide is at the flood to sail boldly out to wider seas of human rights.

"Create in us the splendor that dawns when hearts are kind,
That knows not race nor station as boundaries of the mind;
That learns to value beauty in heart, and brain and soul,
And long to bind God's children into one perfect whole."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 27, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 400) for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH, ADMINISTRATRIX OF THE ESTATE OF KATE E. HAMILTON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 108)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 514, entitled "An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton."

This bill authorizes and directs the payment by the Secretary of the Treasury to Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, the sum of \$7,025.60, together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum from November 23, 1939, until the date of payment by the Secretary in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for refund of the taxes erroneously paid.

Mrs. Kate E. Hamilton died intestate in Memphis, Tenn., on December 1, 1930. On December 31, 1931, Mrs. Blanche H. Karsch paid an estate tax with interest of \$26,017.15, and on January 24, 1933, paid an additional tax, with interest, amounting to \$1,400.40. Litigation involving the estate was not completed until 1939.

Mrs. Karsch filed a claim for refund on November 25, 1939, which was rejected on December 15, 1939, by virtue of section 319 (b) of title III (Estate Tax) of the Revenue Act of 1926 which provides as follows:

All claims for the refunding of the tax imposed by this title alleged to have been